

230.065
M288e

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.



Dean Hoffman Fund

ENGLISH MODERNISM

And He that sat on the throne said: "Behold I make all things new."
St. John the Divine.

I believe that the men who may be called the English Modernists are not unsettling the faith, but interpreting it, and making it clear to the modern man, and within a generation they will be looked back to as men who helped to build the faith of the English Church.

Bishop Hicks of Lincoln in Convocation, 1914.

There are, at present, few signs that English Modernism will commit itself either to the adventurous intellectualism of American Universities or to the adventurous extravagance of popular religion.

Bishop Barnes of Birmingham in 1923.

ENGLISH MODERNISM

ITS ORIGIN, METHODS, AIMS

*Being the William Belden Noble Lectures delivered in
Harvard University, 1925-1926*

BY

H. D. A. MAJOR, M.A., D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF RIPON HALL, OXFORD
AND EDITOR OF "THE MODERN CHURCHMAN"



CAMBRIDGE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON : HUMPHREY MILFORD

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1927

BT

78

.M37

1927

~~230.065~~

~~M288E~~

63335

COPYRIGHT, 1927
BY THE PRESIDENT AND FELLOWS OF
HARVARD COLLEGE

HARVARD COLLEGE
YRABU
1907 W3M

PRINTED AT THE HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U. S. A.

gs new
divine.

lists a
r to t
ck to

1914

mmes
Univ

23

THE
WILLIAM BELDEN NOBLE
LECTURES

THIS LECTURESHIP WAS CONSTITUTED A PERPETUAL FOUNDATION IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY IN 1898, AS A MEMORIAL TO THE LATE WILLIAM BELDEN NOBLE OF WASHINGTON, D.C. (HARVARD, 1885). THE DEED OF GIFT PROVIDES THAT THE LECTURES SHALL BE NOT LESS THAN SIX IN NUMBER, THAT THEY SHALL BE DELIVERED ANNUALLY, AND, IF CONVENIENT, IN THE PHILLIPS BROOKS HOUSE, DURING THE SEASON OF ADVENT. EACH LECTURER SHALL HAVE AMPLE NOTICE OF HIS APPOINTMENT, AND THE PUBLICATION OF EACH COURSE OF LECTURES IS REQUIRED. THE PURPOSE OF THE LECTURESHIP WILL BE FURTHER SEEN IN THE FOLLOWING CITATION FROM THE DEED OF GIFT BY WHICH IT WAS ESTABLISHED:

THE WILLIAM BELDEN NOBLE LECTURES

“The object of the founder of the Lectures is to continue the mission of William Belden Noble, whose supreme desire it was to extend the influence of Jesus as the way, the truth, and the life; to make known the meaning of the words of Jesus, ‘I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.’ In accordance with the large interpretation of the Influence of Jesus by the late Phillips Brooks, with whose religious teaching he in whose memory the Lectures are established and also the founder of the Lectures were in deep sympathy, it is intended that the scope of the Lectures shall be as wide as the highest interests of humanity. With this end in view, — the perfection of the spiritual man and the consecration by the spirit of Jesus of every department of human character, thought, and activity, — the Lectures may include philosophy, literature, art, poetry, the natural sciences, political economy, sociology, ethics, history, both civil and ecclesiastical, as well as theology and the more direct interests of the religious life. Beyond a sympathy with the purpose of the Lectures, as thus defined, no restriction is placed upon the lecturer.”

gs new
divine

nists
it to

PREFACE

Preparing these lectures for the press I have left except for some minor alterations, as I delivered them, but have included certain sections which were forced to omit at the time of delivery. I had to re-write them and to give them a more formal and less colloquial form. This has proved a task, and perhaps it is not even desirable. The present is itself a mediating and temporary stage in an age of transition. Any account therefore of English Modernism can have but an ephemeral character. It is the answer of the watchman to the calls of our English Zion to the query of the benighted inhabitant: "Watchman, what of the night?" As the day dawns, the watchman's prognostications are no longer needed.

Gratitude is due to the President and Fellows of Harvard College for the honour they did me in asking me to deliver the Noble Lectures. My thanks are also due to Mrs. Noble and to those members of the University who showed me much kindness on the occasion of my very pleasant visit, and particularly to my host and hostess, Mrs. McComb. I wish also to express my thanks to the Rev. F. L. Cross, M.A., B.Sc., Chaplain of Ripon Hall, for valuable assistance in correcting the proofs.

HENRY D. A. MAJOR

CLARENDON, OXFORD
City Term, 1926

gs new

divine

nists a

ar to *

to

ck to

1914

mmes

Univ

'33

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. THE LARGER MODERNISM	8
III. ENGLISH MODERNISM AND ITS IMMEDIATE PREDECESSORS	18
IV. THE ANGLICAN'S RIGHT TO BE A MODERNIST	43
V. THE CAUSES WHICH CONVERT THE TRADITION- ALIST INTO A MODERNIST	54
VI. MODERNISM AND NEW TRUTH	58
VII. POSTULATES OF MODERNIST APOLOGETIC	69
VIII. MODERNISM AND DOGMA	79
IX. MODERNIST RECONSTRUCTION	97
X. MODERNISM AND MIRACLES	125
XI. MODERNISM AND JESUS CHRIST	139
XII. MODERNISM AND THE CREEDS	171
XIII. THE MODERNIST'S TASK AND HIS ALLIES	193
XIV. MODERNISM AND THE FUTURE	205
APPENDICES	229
BIBLIOGRAPHY	257
INDEX	265

gs new
livine.

nists :
tr "o *

ENGLISH MODERNISM

5s new

Moine.

lists a

or "o"

INTRODUCTION

My subject is English Modernism. In thinking it over, I had first to ask myself how best to treat it in these lectures. Ought I to treat it from the outside or from the inside? Should I treat it historically and critically, or didactically and apologetically, as an interpreter rather than as a critic? There is no difficulty about treating it historically and critically. Such a method of treatment would certainly be appropriate to a series of lectures delivered on an academic foundation. There seemed, however, from my point of view to be a serious objection to this method. To treat English Modernism in a purely historical and critical way would necessitate a certain aloofness from the theme which would give a false impression of my real attitude towards it. An ardent believer in English Modernism is no more justified in posing as its impartial critic, than is the counsel for the defence in a law court justified in usurping the seat of the judge. I am a protagonist for English Modernism. I have been connected with its activities and endeavours for some twenty years. It would be hypocrisy for me, in the presence of this audience, to pretend to take a strictly impartial view of its merits and demerits, and to predict its prospects of success with scientific coldness.

You have had of late a number of able English Churchmen coming to America and talking about Modernism. Not one of them was an avowed Modernist. You will in my case, at least, have the advantage or disadvantage of listening to one talking about Modernism who is an avowed, even though he be a misguided, Modernist. If convention should require me to appear in the academic robes of the University lecturer, let it be clearly understood that I roam my native heath in the hairy garment of a Modernist prophet, and that I am even now wearing the *adereth* beneath the gown.

Although I speak as a prophet of Modernism, — and it should be remembered that interpretation, not prediction, is the prophet's real function, — I shall not ignore the need for historic treatment and scientific accuracy, nor, I hope, that sense of proportion which is the basis not only of humour, but of all sound judgment. After the example of Goethe, who strove to view the events of everyday life against the background of the universal tendency, my desire is to see our English Modernism against that tremendous background; and although that vision does not make me believe less in English Modernism, it does prohibit me from being such a fool as to believe in nothing else.

Modernism is a movement — one of a long series in the history of the Christian Religion. Like each of them, it has its contribution to make — a necessary and valuable contribution — towards the presentation of that religion to the men of this age; but it must not be supposed that it is the last movement

that Christianity will require to give it that universal form which will enable it to make an irresistible appeal to every human being just in proportion as he is spiritual, moral, and rational. That transformation is the ideal of the Modernist, his ultimate objective, but he can hardly hope to achieve it just at once. I suppose that, in order to be quite honest, I ought to admit that every enthusiastic Modernist expects Modernism to make the Christian Religion universal. He expects it to make the Christian Church able to realize that great ideal for humanity expressed in the tremendous phrase in St. Paul's *Epistle to the Ephesians*, "all one in Christ"; but every intelligent Modernist is aware that the history of humanity discloses the successive emergence in human nature of higher and still higher needs, and that as a consequence there has been in the past a constant reformation and re-presentation of religion to meet those needs. Christianity, in the light of its nature and history, so it seems to the Modernist, is the religion, or the form of religion, supremely capable of such adaptation; but though he feels that the adaptation of traditional Christianity, which Modernism can and will achieve, will render it capable of meeting the religious needs of this age, he cannot as a student of human history feel convinced that future ages may not see the emergence of higher needs, to meet which present-day Modernist Christianity will have to undergo still further adaptations — adaptations which have not even been visualized by the Modernist of to-day.

I am not a climber of mountains, but years ago in Syria I had it in my mind to climb Mount Hermon. My companion and I — it was late in the spring — soon got above the snow-line and hastened on — up and over the fields of snow. The view as we looked back over the Syrian plain seemed immense; we had a growing sense of height and loneliness; small clouds were drifting past; the summit appeared in sight. Now, at last, we had reached it. But what did we find? A great valley and a higher peak in front; we had only surmounted a ridge. That experience is a parable.

English Modernism, as I hope it will appear, has a close affinity to the purpose of this Lectureship. William Belden Noble, while he took what will seem to some a very comprehensive view of the Christian Religion, was himself a profound believer in that religion, and it was to contribute to the presentation of that religion as an essential factor in human progress and an indispensable element in human culture, that the Lectureship was founded. The deed of giving influence of Jesus as the way, the truth, and the life, and to make known the meaning of the words in Jesus, "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly."

By the English Modernist true Christianity is seen as the product of the operation in human history of the Spirit that was in Jesus Christ; and the aim of the English Modernist is to set free that Spirit from those archaic dogmatic shackles and ecclesiastical burdens, great and grievous to but

borne, which are hindering it from exerting its full and proper influence in the modern world.

I feel therefore that in using the privilege of this Lectureship to speak on behalf of Modernism, especially English Modernism, I am acting in accordance with the spirit of the foundation.

II

THE LARGER MODERNISM

Entre une religion inintelligente et un matérialisme brutal, âme poétique et pure, où serait ta place? — RENAN.

WHAT is Modernism? Modernism consists in the claim of the modern mind to determine what is true, right, and beautiful in the light of its own experience, even though its conclusions be in contradiction to those of tradition. It is this which in practice constitutes Modernism, whether in religion, ethics, or art. The intellectual task of Modernism is the criticism of tradition in the light of research and enlarging experience, with the purpose of reformulating and reinterpreting it to serve the needs of the present age. Murray's *New English Dictionary* (in the section issued in July, 1907) defines Modernism in a less radical manner, as the following of modern methods. It uses a citation from the *Westminster Gazette* of 1887 to illustrate this use of the term:

The Roman Church and the American Republic . . . one typifying Mediævalism, the other illustrating with tolerable fidelity the spirit of Modernism.

In Murray's *Dictionary* there is no indication of the word Modernist having a particular religious use, although the word itself goes back to Tudor times, and its Latin equivalent, *modernista*, was used by Luther.

In the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (1910-11) there is no article on Modernism, nor is there in the more recent appendix to the *Encyclopædia*.

In Hastings's *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (1915), there is an article on Modernism, but it is confined to a religious movement in the Roman Catholic Church. This indicates conclusively that the religious and ecclesiastical use of the terms Modernism and Modernist is Romanist in its origin. Romanist Modernism is both like and unlike English Modernism. Later on, I shall deal with this point; meanwhile I propose, by means of a series of quotations, Romanist, Protestant, English, French, and American, to illustrate my definition of Modernism as it bears upon religion.

Father George Tyrrell, a brilliant Jesuit, and the leading Romanist Modernist in the English-speaking world, thus defines its objective:

I think that the best description of Modernism is that it is the desire and effort to find a new theological synthesis, consistent with the data of historico-critical research. . . . By a Modernist I mean a churchman of any sort who believes in the possibility of a synthesis between the essential truth of his religion and the essential truth of modernity.

Professor Percy Gardner, the classical archaeologist, writes:

Modernism is based upon evolution in science and the critical method in history; and it demands, not that the great truths of the Christian religion shall be given

up, but that they shall be considered afresh in the light of growing knowledge, and restated in a way suitable to the intellectual conditions of the age.

Mrs. Humphry Ward, the novelist, thus described its aim:

Modernism is the attempt of the modern spirit, acting religiously, to refashion Christianity, *not outside, but inside the warm limits of the ancient churches*, to secure not a reduced, but a transformed Christianity.

Dr. Sanday, the New Testament scholar, thus defined his aim as a Modernist:

I do not disclaim the term Modernist. The name describes justly what I aim at being. I aim at thinking the thoughts and speaking the language of my own day, and yet, at the same time, keeping all that is essential in the religion of the past.

Dr. Newman Smyth, the American moralist, defined Modernism thus:

Modernism is a certain attitude of mind corresponding to our times: it is a tendency of thought rather than a body of doctrine: a vitalizing spirit making all things new rather than a full-grown and completed theology: an intellectual method rather than a formulated creed.

Professor Paul Sabatier (the biographer of St. Francis) supports this definition:

Le modernisme n'est pas ni un parti, ni une école, que c'est une orientation.

Dr. MacBride Sterrett's definition of it, in his useful book, *Modernism in Religion*, is as follows:

Modernism stands for a new spirit and for modern methods in the study and teaching of religion and ethics. Surely it does not stand for a set of negations, unless modern learning negatives some of the older learning. It accepts the results of modern methods, and asks that they be incorporated with older views. It does not offer a new set of dogmas, but it does ask for a modern interpretation of the older ones. It insists that religion is more vital than theology and must be distinguished from it. It alters our scientific, historical, and theological outlook, but leaves our personal relation to Christ untouched. It is a vitalizing spirit making all things new, and an intellectual method rather than a formulated creed.

But I like this definition of Dr. Sterrett's better. It is shorter and simpler, and it shows Modernism as an essentially educational movement:

Modernists are simply Christians who are trying to live, and to get others to live, in better harmony with our universe of thought. And we wish to get the teaching church to be a church learning the new learning.

Archdeacon Lilley in his book on Modernism defines it thus:

Modernism is the attempt to reach a new theological synthesis.

This synthesis, Professor Percy Gardner describes as

combining in a higher unity the two ways of looking at Christian history, the evolutionary and the inspirational.

Dr. R. W. Macan, late Master of University College, Oxford, regards Modernism as a new apologetic. He writes:

Modernism is not a religion, it is a defence of religion, and of the Christian Religion.

The foregoing descriptions or definitions of Modernism are sympathetic. Here are two which are hostile: the first from the *Catholic Encyclopædia* and the second from the Encyclical of Pope Pius X.

Modernism aims at a radical transformation of human thought in relation to God, man, the world, and life here and hereafter.

Modernism is the compendium and poisonous essence of all heresies.

Mr. G. B. Shaw, in his Preface to *Back to Methuselah*, brings home the aim of Modernism more forcibly than it appears in the citations I have given:

We desire to extricate the eternal spirit of religion from the sludgy residue of temporalities and legends that are making belief impossible, though they are the stock-in-trade of all the Churches.

All these citations refer to a Modernism which is Christian, whether Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Anglican. But even if Modernism originated in Christianity, we should be wrong in regarding it as limited to Christianity. The *Times* (London) of September 15, 1925, in a leading article, speaks of the Egyptian Sheikh Abdel Razek's relation to the "Modernist movement in Islam, with its corollaries, the greater social freedom of women, the progressive laicization of the theocratic Mohammedan state, and the reform of Moslem education." This Egyptian Modernism, although it threatens a

political crisis in Egypt, is but the pale reflection of the Turkish Modernism of Kemal Pasha. Some would claim that Russian Bolshevism in some of its aspects is a form of religious Modernism, although it regards religion as the opiate of the people. If it be Modernism, and not reaction, which I strongly suspect, it is a kind of Modernism that I have no desire to commend. Jewish Modernism, under the leadership of Mr. Claude Montefiore, is firmly established in England, and it has its zealous representatives in other countries, especially America. Hindu Modernism, in the form of the Arya Samaj and the Brahmo Samaj, is well known; but Indian Modernism is far more widely spread than these organized efforts suggest, and far older. The Laws of Manu (about 300 B.C.) condemn modernist departures from the teaching of the Veda (dated at least 1000 B.C.). The passage, which I owe to Professor Hume of the Union Seminary of New York, runs as follows:

All those traditions and all those despicable systems of philosophy which are not based on the Veda, produce no reward after death: for they are declared to be founded on darkness. All those doctrines differing from the Veda which spring up and soon perish, are worthless and false, because they are of modern date.

Much of the present ferment in China, although it takes a political form, is essentially a product of religious Modernism, which has penetrated into Chinese society through the great Christian educational missions in that country.

In September, 1924, Mr. Victor Branford, in a book entitled *Living Religions: A Plea for the Larger Modernism*¹ directs attention to a scientific modernist movement running parallel with religious modernism and promising to unite with it. The opening words of Mr. Branford's preface present with admirable lucidity the Larger Modernism for which he pleads. He writes (page vii):

Modernism has to be conceived not merely, nor even mainly, as a movement of critical scholarship. There is an underlying issue of pervasive readaptation between old and new. Viewed in this wider way, Modernism is by no means confined to the Catholic religion. Kindred endeavours towards readjustment have long been stirring in Hebraism, Hinduism, Mohammedanism, and other venerable religions. All these movements are infused by a common purpose. It is to renew, in the light of current knowledge, yet also of contemporary aspiration, the eternal verities enshrined in ancient faiths. So viewed, Modernism in religion comes into relation with Modernism in science. The latter is concerned with endeavours, now widely beginning, towards putting our whole body of verified knowledge to better use and finer purpose than hitherto. The aim is no less than to unify, spiritualise, and thus consecrate our sciences, at present too isolated, and often profaned by their outcome in practice. These two movements, which seek, one of them to modernise the religions, and the other to consecrate the sciences by integrating them in the service of life, will be the more fruitful the closer their union.

¹ Published by Williams and Norgate.

This agrees with Dr. Sanday's conception of the ultimate aim of Modernism. Some words of his uttered towards the end of his life and published in 1920 bring this out clearly:

The ultimate goal is the unification of thought, the fusion of all secular and all religious thinking in one comprehensive and harmonious system. If I am not mistaken, that unification is nearer than it has been for a very long time.

Although my subject is English Modernism, I do not think that to have glanced, at the outset, for a few minutes at this larger Modernism is to have strayed. We ought all the time to be conscious of its existence and endeavours. Within a few decades it will have assumed enormous proportions. In comparison with it English Modernism may seem a very small thing, but that will not mean that it is necessarily an insignificant thing. Ancient Athens was a small city of some ten thousand citizens, but it was not insignificant. It was the head of a civilization for which humanity is infinitely the richer. Great Britain is a small island — but it is not therefore insignificant; and I dare to think that, if English Modernism can solve its problems aright, it will not be solving them for itself alone: it will in some measure be solving them for humanity as well. It was Guizot, the French statesman and historian, who prophesied that, if Christendom were ever to be united, it would be through the agency of the English Church.

How to turn to good account the impact of modern knowledge on our inherited religion and ethics;

how, without injuring its influence and lowering public morality, to relieve our ancient religion from the incubus of traditions which research has shown to be false; how "to combine, as in binocular vision, the religious and scientific aspects of life," or the inspirational and evolutionary; how in the face of secularist scepticism and materialistic naturalism to preserve what Wordsworth has described as

Plain living and high thinking . . .

The homely beauty of the good old cause,

. . . our peace, our fearful innocence,

And pure religion breathing household laws —

these and other such are the problems which to-day are facing religious and moral leaders all the world over, and which many of them most unwillingly are being compelled to solve. These are a very important class of problem, — more important by far than many which occupy public attention at present, — and if English Churchmen can solve them satisfactorily for themselves, other communions will benefit by it. Not that actual coöperation in Modernist endeavour between different religious communions is, I think, possible, or indeed profitable at this stage. Intervention of any kind would be harmful because resented. Each religious communion must settle the preliminary stages at least of its own Modernist problems. The Modernist problems of each communion are alike in the main, but differ in numerous important particulars. It is the intelligent and loyal members of each communion who can best guide it through the earlier stages of its Modernist transition; those who are not

members of the communion can do little, save in one direction. There is the influence of example. We can receive inspiration from it, and we can receive warning. We sometimes hardly realize how much we help other people to cultivate their gardens, by letting them see us cultivating our own.

III

ENGLISH MODERNISM AND ITS IMMEDIATE PREDECESSORS

Christianity is at the cross-roads to-day, but what is often forgotten is that it has often been at the cross-roads before. The historical study of Christianity shows that the conception of a fixed, stereotyped, unchanging Christianity is a mere myth.

— HASTINGS RASHDALL.

It has to be considered whether the intellectual forms under which Christianity has been described may not be in a state of transition and resolution, in this respect contrasting with the never-changing truth of the Christian life. — BENJAMIN JOWETT.

THE purpose of this section is to provide a brief account of the origin of the Modernist Movement and to indicate the characteristics of English Modernism particularly in relation to some other religious movements with which it may be and is confused.

Modernism has a somewhat different significance for Modernists in different localities. In the Roman Church Modernism is opposed to Mediævalism; in the English Church Modernism, as in Holland, is opposed to Traditionalism; in America Modernism is opposed to Fundamentalism. German Modernism, notwithstanding the voluminous character of Heiler's book, is not sufficiently developed to reveal what is its exact antithesis. The endeavour of its opponents everywhere is to show that Modernism is opposed to Christianity; but that charge the Modernist denies.

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 19

The term Modernism in its religious or ecclesiastical sense came from Roman Catholicism. In his treatise on *Modernism in Italy*,¹ published in 1909, L. H. Jordan writes:

Modernism as it is known in Italy to-day began about the year 1850. Its representatives at that time were not called *catholici modernisti* but *catholici riformisti*. . . Its paternity is traceable to Rosmini and Gioberti. . . . Of the representatives of Modernism in Austria, Switzerland, Germany, Belgium, France, England, and the United States, . . . it should not be overlooked that all these leaders owe their inspiration, indirectly if not directly, to Italy.

Mazzini's speeches and writings, although he broke with the Vatican, were as great a liberating influence in the ecclesiastical and theological spheres as in the political world of Italy.

The word *Modernisti* began to be used ecclesiastically during the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII, whose policy encouraged it if it did not actually originate it. Aware of the great advances in knowledge which were being made in the second half of the nineteenth century, Leo XIII initiated an educational policy in the Roman Catholic seminaries for raising the intellectual standard of the clergy, so as to enable them to contend successfully for the Faith against its opponents. This policy was highly successful and produced a brilliant band of Roman Catholic scholars, chief of whom were Loisy and Duchesne. These men and many others trained

¹ Oxford University Press.

pecially to defend Roman Catholicism seemed to the Roman authorities to be using their knowledge to sap its very foundations. Leo XIII was disquieted, but left the problem to be dealt with by his successor Pius X, the Peasant Pope, who took drastic steps to stamp the movement out, and on September 8, 1907, condemned it in his famous Encyclical Letter entitled *Pascendi Gregis*. His methods were highly successful: the movement was crushed, and its adherents excommunicated and driven underground. They owed their defeat to a number of causes.

(1) The uncompromising, tireless, and skilfully organized opposition of the Roman authorities.

(2) The general indifference to religion of the educated classes in Roman Catholic countries. There was practically no lay support for the movement. A few highly educated and religious laymen, like Don Romolo Murri, Professor Salvatore Minocchi, Signor Antonio Fogazzaro, supported it, but such men were very few.

(3) The Modernist position was an impossible one within the Roman Communion. Notwithstanding all the Modernist protestations of love, loyalty, and devotion to the Roman Catholic Church, the Modernists were asking the Papacy to grant what it could not grant without consenting to a religious revolution. The Modernists demanded a right to think for themselves, a right of research, a right of freedom of speech, which the Roman Church has never permitted since the Council of Trent.

For these three causes of failure the Modernists

were not to blame. They cannot however be exempted from blame in connection with two other causes of failure.

(1) Their persistent recourse to anonymous publication. "Personality," as Jordan remarks, "is a factor which counts tremendously in a struggle of this character"; but the method of anonymous publication, which they used widely, gave the impression that the exponents of Modernist opinions were afraid to face the penalties. A cause which triumphs may not demand martyrs, but at least it demands the martyr-spirit. "Private Conferences, furtive correspondence, anonymous books and pamphlets," and methods of invisibility generally, suggest cowardice — although let me hasten to add that many of those who used them were not cowards. They used them because they thought it sound tactics. It made their movement look bigger than it was. It was not cowardice but camouflage.

(2) The Roman Catholic Modernist position was fundamentally unsound. It seemed, even to those who sympathized with its aims, to support a pantheistic theology, a pragmatist philosophy, and a polytheistic worship, in the name of scientific research, historical criticism, and Jesus Christ. Yet, on the other hand, though its *methods* were open to serious criticism, its *aims* were altogether admirable. It asked that Catholic dogma might be permitted to develop; that Biblical exegesis should be made conformable to the results of higher criticism; that Catholic worship should be purged of gross superstitions; that the Church should surrender its in-

ordinate love of spiritual and temporal power; that education, not revolutionary agitation, should be the method of securing reforms.

The Modernist Movement in the Roman Church aroused much interest in English circles in the early years of the present century.

The Reverend A. L. Lilley's able series of articles on Modernism, published in the *Guardian* and *Commonwealth* from 1902 to 1907 (before they appeared as a volume in 1908),¹ had many readers.

It was in the year 1902 that M. Loisy's striking and clear-cut book, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, appeared, in criticism of Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christenthums*. This in 1904 was attacked by Mr. Inge, then a Fellow of Hertford College, Oxford, in a sermon delivered in the University Church. He criticized scathingly the new movement, particularly as exemplified in the teaching of M. Loisy, whom he charged with separating the Jesus of history from the Christ of the Catholic Church, and then identifying the latter with the Catholic Church itself. As an auditor of that sermon I recollect quite vividly the impression produced by the delivery of the following passage:

Alas! we cannot recognise this identification. We traverse as we are bidden, with our mind's eye, the long centuries of Church history. There rises before our imagination a figure splendid but terrible, with the light of contemplation and the fire of devoted enthusiasm in her eye, but splashed with innocent blood, like the Rider of the Apocalypse, even to the horse-bridle,

¹ *Modernism: A Record and Review*, published by Pitman.

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 23

the cruel oppressor of liberty, the bigoted enemy of truth. Is this figure an object of Divine honours? Yes, perhaps: but that this is the historic Christ, of which Jesus of Nazareth is the germ — who can assert it?

Meanwhile, the brilliant volumes of the English (or rather Irish) Jesuit Father, George Tyrrell, were circulating widely among Anglo-Catholics early in the century. *Lex Orandi* was published in 1903. An Anglo-Catholic friend, now a Roman priest, presented me with several of Tyrrell's volumes in 1904.

In 1908 the fourth of M. Loisy's four little red volumes, *Les Petits Livres Rouges*, crossed the Channel. The same year M. Paul Sabatier, at the invitation of the Jowett Committee, delivered in London his illuminating lectures on *Les Modernistes*.¹

The same year also saw the publication by T. Fisher Unwin of *The Programme of Modernism*, an English translation of the Italian Modernists' reply to the Encyclical Letter *Pascendi Gregis*, together with a translation of the Encyclical itself. Somewhat later there appeared in the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Quarterly* a number of brilliant articles by Alfred Fawkes, published in 1913 by John Murray in a volume entitled *Studies in Modernism*. Last but not least there were the English writings and addresses of Baron Friedrich von Hügel, of whom M. Sabatier wrote in 1908: "*M. de Hügel est devenu en quelque sorte l'évêque laïque des Modernistes.*"

I have a reason for dwelling somewhat fully on the publicity given in England to the Roman Modernist Movement. It is not unusual for English

¹ Published by Fischbacher, Paris, 1909.

Liberal Protestants to assert that there is no connection between English Modernism and Roman Catholic Modernism, and that the English Modernists are the lineal and legitimate descendants of the old Broad Churchmen and Liberal Churchmen of the nineteenth century.

The latter part of this statement is correct, but not the former. Roman Modernism has had an effect on English Modernism, and I am disposed to think that this influence accounts in some measure — not by any means altogether — for the difference between Broad or Liberal Churchmen and English Modernists. That influence came in mainly through the Anglo-Catholic school. To-day English Modernism consists of two wings, Liberal Protestant and Liberal Catholic, of which the former is growing weaker and the latter stronger. The existence of the Liberal Catholic wing owes much to the writings of von Hügel, Tyrrell, Brémond, Mignot, Paul Sabatier, Duchesne, Loisy, Houtin, Le Roy, Batiffol, Laberthonnière and other Roman Catholic Modernists. As the reading of *Lux Mundi* led Tractarians to see that it was possible to accept the main results of the critical studies of the Scriptures and yet to remain loyal Churchmen, so these Roman Modernist writers seemed at the time to prove, at least to some sympathetic Anglo-Catholics, that it was possible to indulge in the freest criticism of the dogmas, institutions, and policy of the Church, and yet be and remain ardent Catholics.

I propose now to deal with the way in which English Modernism, as distinguished from English Broad Churchmanship, has come into existence.

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 25

Broad Churchmanship had three disadvantages as the designation of what to-day is known as English Modernism, and in relating them, the difference between the older Broad Churchmen and our English Modernists will become apparent.

(1) First, a strongly Erastian flavour adhered to the designation Broad Churchman, and not unjustly, for Broad Churchmen were disposed to regard the English Church as merely the organized religious aspect of the English people — a partner, but a junior partner, of the English State — and the clergy as members of the civil service and executive, deriving their authority not from Christ but from the Crown. Hence Broad Churchmen denied that the Church had any right to spiritual independence and autonomy. It was opposition to this Erastian theory and temper which was the real *fons et origo* of the Tractarian Movement and made John Keble's Assize Sermon on National Apostasy, in 1833, a trumpet-call to assert the spiritual rights of the Church. English Modernists to-day stand beside the early Tractarians in this matter.

While Modernists recognize the enormous value both to Church and State of the present alliance between them, and would be exceedingly sorry for the sake of the English nation to see it terminated, — for it has helped to make that nation one of the most moral and spiritual of all nations, — yet they do not, and cannot, regard that alliance as depriving the Church of its inherent right of spiritual autonomy. Nor does it to-day really deprive the Church of such right. If, for instance, the English

Crown nominates, as it does, the English bishops, it is only because the great majority of English Churchmen desire this method of episcopal election to continue. Like marriage, the alliance between Church and State demands concessions on both sides and is dependent on the maintenance of mutual love and reverence. The growth of a materialist secularism on the part of the State or of an arrogant and narrow ecclesiasticism on the part of the Church must inevitably terminate the alliance, but the Modernist hopes that English good sense and good feeling will prevail, and that an alliance which did not offend such Anglican saints as Richard Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, George Herbert, and Bishop Butler, in days when the State was much more tyrannical than it is at present, will not, especially if certain reasonable adjustments can be made, be repudiated by the Church of to-day as an intolerable alliance, or by the State as an onerous and impossible obligation.

(2) A second objection to the title Broad Churchman lay in the Broad Church tendency to identify Christianity with a rationalistic humanitarian utilitarianism. Pray excuse the *sesquipedalia verba*. Broad Churchmanship was very much at ease in Zion. It was too comfortable, and it had almost too much common sense. The Divine Call to membership in a spiritual society requires a higher standard of endeavour and aspiration than that which satisfies the demands of ordinary good conduct. "Called to be saints" was a formula to which the Broad Churchman seemed unable to attach any particular

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 27

significance beyond that it inculcated good conduct.
Christina Rossetti's poem,

I saw one like to Christ so luminously
By patient deeds of love,

breathes another atmosphere.

(3) A third objection to the designation Broad Churchman lay in the Broad Church attitude to Church doctrine and exegesis. That attitude was flaccid and unhistorical. In the process of exposition the historic meaning was not rigorously elucidated. Too often the true meaning evaporated, or was transmuted into whatever the Broad Church teacher desired it to become. Disraeli's epigram, "No dogmas, no deans," prompted by Dean Stanley's latitudinarian interpretation of the Church formularies, and the definition of Broad Church inflicted on the great Master of Balliol, Benjamin Jowett, by a German professor: "Flim-flam, vish-vosh vot you call Broad Church," illustrate this weakness. Yet it may be justly claimed that in his exegesis of Scripture Jowett was a Liberal Churchman rather than a Broad Churchman. It was he who said, "Interpret the Bible like any other book." Dr. Arnold, Archbishop Whately, Bishop Thirlwall, and Dean Stanley, although Broad Churchmen, had a strong historical sense which they were ready to use in Biblical exegesis. In this respect they were more akin to their successors, the Liberal Churchmen who came under the influence of German Biblical criticism, than to Frederick Denison Maurice, who interpreted Scripture in the mystical and allegorical

method of the Catechetical School of Alexandria. The main objection to the title Liberal Churchman was its political significance. Gilbert's distich,

Every boy and every girl that's born into this world alive
Is either a little Liberal or else a little Conservative,

means to ordinary English ears an adherent of one or other of the two great political parties. When the term Liberal Churchman was used, it was difficult to induce the ordinary Englishman to realize that it had no political significance, especially when all the better-known Liberal Churchmen were Liberals in politics.

In 1908 a volume appeared, entitled *Anglican Liberalism*,¹ consisting of twelve essays by Liberal Churchmen, and at least ten out of the twelve essayists were political Liberals, one a former member of a Liberal Cabinet. This political significance of the term Liberal was so confusing that Sir Edward Russell (afterwards Lord Russell of Liverpool), himself a Liberal politician and journalist, suggested to me that where political Liberalism was intended it would be best to spell it with a capital *L*, but where ecclesiastical Liberalism was intended a small *l* should be used!

Another objection to the term Liberal Churchman was that it suggested an affinity with Liberal Protestantism. Again, this affinity was no more imaginary than the political affinity. Liberal Protestantism, under the influence particularly of Harnack, Wendt, Beyschlag, Pfeiderer, Weinelt, Bous-

¹ Published by Williams and Norgate.

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 29

set, and a host of others in Germany, and of the leaders of the *symbolofidéiste* school in France,—Auguste Sabatier, Albert Réville, Edouard Ménégoz,—had become the dominant note of English Liberal Churchmanship.

About 1908 a change began to set in. The well-known English scholar, Professor F. C. Burkitt, in the essay which he contributed to *Anglican Liberalism* opened with these words:

Liberalism is a word that is losing its charm as a popular label, and many people may think its association with Theology altogether incongruous. . . . Liberalism now-a-days conveys to some minds a notion of flatness and vagueness, a notion of halting in a half-way house.

In 1910 the same writer published a paper entitled *The Failure of Liberal Christianity*, which dealt a serious blow to the ecclesiastical use of the word Liberal. As a consequence the Liberal Churchman's attitude seemed to his fellow Churchmen to be defective in various ways. He was too much of an individualist in religion. He had too little love for the Church and its historic claims. He found his social life, not in an ecclesiastical fellowship, but in civic and philanthropic activities. He feared institutionalism, and the history of the Church did not seem to him to be, as it did to Bishop Lightfoot, "a cordial for drooping spirits," but a just reason for depression. It seemed to him, as to Rudolf Sohm, that the history of Christianity was simply the history of a prolonged aberration from the religion of Jesus. Corruption began early: first that pure,

✓ simple, universal religion — so spiritual and so ethical — was Judaized, then Hellenized, then Romanized, then mediævalized — and, generally speaking, paganized and vulgarized. The Liberal Churchman's conception of historic Christianity was that of the kernel and the husk, or the combination of the essential with the non-essential. The Liberal Churchman had very little interest in the existing Church. What he was interested in was *the essence of Christianity*, and this he was perpetually seeking, mainly by removing layer after layer of non-essentials. He was quite sure that by this means he could arrive at the essence; to traditionalists he appeared to be skinning the onion: a process which threatened to end in absolute loss. Certainly in Germany this kind of research robbed Protestantism of vigour and vitality: and although it liberated its spirit, it almost deprived it of its body.

✓ The Roman Modernist wished to substitute for the kernel and the husk the conception of the acorn and the oak, for he regarded the history of Christianity, not as one long aberration, but as a divinely guided development. This acorn and oak conception seemed to the rising school of English Modernists as unsatisfactory as the kernel and the husk. To regard every historic development of the Christian Church as essentially Christian is impossible. Professor Percy Gardner seemed on much surer ground when, in his *Growth of Christianity*, he presented Christianity as the history of the successive endeavours of the Christian Spirit going out into the world to baptize into Christ not simply individ-

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 31

uals, but also ideas and institutions — in many cases with remarkable success, but in other cases with results which have been disastrous. The undertaking is dangerous — but so is life; and as the very life of the Christian Church depends on its ability to influence its environment as a first step toward re-creating and incorporating it, this experiment of baptizing into Christ must be, although so full of danger, the Church's method of extension. The Liberal was right in looking not outside but *inside* for the essence of Christianity — at the kernel rather than at the husk. The Roman Modernist (whether J. H. Newman or Loisy) was also right in looking, not at the *origin* of Christianity, but at its *activity in history* as an indication of what it essentially is. The English Modernist tries to combine the positive elements in the Liberal Protestant's and Roman Modernist's conceptions of what constitutes the essence of Christianity. For the English Modernist the Divine Revelation given in and through Jesus is normative: it is the acid test of all that claims to be moral and spiritual progress. A temper of mind, a method of criticism, a form of experience, which induces its possessor to regard Jesus as increasingly insignificant for the Christian Religion is not, so the English Modernist believes, in the true line of progress, and a movement so inspired must end in a *cul-de-sac*. Whereas a progress which, as it advances, finds by experience that Jesus is becoming increasingly significant is in the true line of moral and spiritual evolution, and has before it the future with all its unimaginable opportunities

and possibilities. Hence the watch-word of the English Modernist is not "Back to Jesus," or "Forward from Jesus," but "Forward with Jesus." In the words of Dean Stanley's hymn,

Far behind we leave the past:
Forward are our glances cast:
Still His words before us range
Through the ages as they change.
Wheresoe'er the truth shall lead
He will give whate'er we need.

The essential nature of Christianity cannot be realized simply by going back into the past. The lure of "Primitiveness," as Dr. H. B. Swete has warned us, may prove as deceptive an *ignis fatuus* as "Mediaevalism." We must direct our attention not only to the past, but also to the present and future of Christianity, for when we know what Christianity is becoming, then we know what Christianity essentially is.¹

Sir John Seeley, the English historian, has said ² that an institution is healthy in proportion to its independence of its own past, and in proportion to the confident freedom with which it alters itself to meet new conditions. This is very true, but it does not mean, as some would take it to mean, "Happy is the nation or institution without a history," but rather, happy is it, if that history prove an inspiration and not a check to free development.

¹ Dr. A. C. Bouquet, another English Modernist, in his Hulsean Lectures 1924-25, entitled *The Christian Religion and its Competitors To-day*, regards essential Christianity as a normative group of ideas given by Christ (pp. 101, 102).

² *Natural Religion*, p. 217.

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 33

But to return to our examination of the Liberal Churchman. The Liberal Churchman was unemotional in his ideals of Church worship, and he did not see here the value of combining Devotion with Art. He disliked ritualism: he was not interested in liturgiology: and he feared the herd-instinct in popular devotions. He used the Sacraments duly as prescribed Church rites, but with none of the delight and imagination either of the mystic or of the aesthete.

Furthermore, the results of Liberal New Testament criticism, after Loisy's attack on Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christenthums* and the appearance of Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, were in some measure discredited. The Liberal was accused by the eschatologists of being afraid to face and accept historical and critical conclusions which were subversive of his liberal theology. The Liberal's critical method was declared to be unsound: it consisted, it was said, in exorcising or eliminating from the traditional records of the life and teaching of Jesus whatever did not appeal to the Liberal mind as rational, moral, and spiritual. As a natural and necessary result of this method Jesus Christ was presented in the likeness of a nineteenth-century Liberal Protestant Christian.

There was exaggeration and injustice in these charges, yet there was truth in them also. The younger Liberals began to recognize that Liberal Churchmanship, to be effective, needed development on comprehensive lines — a development which aimed at a synthesis of what seemed to be the

truth both in Liberal Protestantism and in Modernist Romanism. This synthesis was achieved, not consciously and deliberately, but almost subconsciously, mainly under the influence of the presence of a powerful and propagandist Anglo-Catholicism, which demanded (not vocally, but logically from the necessities of the situation) that Liberals should understand it and if possible coöperate with it in the interests of national religion and national morality. Anglo-Catholicism (and Catholicism generally) evidently possessed some religious values which Liberalism had not retained. Such were, for instance, the inspiration afforded by a strong sense of historic continuity with a heroic if idealized past; the realization of the value for the moral and spiritual life of sacramental and symbolic acts in Divine worship; the value of the consecration of art to the service of religion in the forms of architecture, painting, sculpture, and ceremonial. Liberalism had recognized the value of art in music, poetry, and oratory, and the value of the social element in religious worship as exemplified in the well-known lines of S. T. Coleridge:

'Tis sweeter far to me
To walk together to the Kirk
With a goodly company!
To walk together to the Kirk
And all together pray,
While each to his great Father bends,
Old men, and babes, and loving friends
And youths and maidens gay!

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 35

On the other hand, Liberal Churchmanship did as clearly possess religious and moral values which Anglo-Catholicism did not possess, such as love of freedom of thought and reverence for scientific truth; a belief in certain inalienable rights of the human personality; a belief in the sacredness of the nation and its government; a belief too in the claims of a brotherhood and service of man transcending all ecclesiastical limits. Not only did a close examination of contemporary Christianity bear witness to the need for a modern synthesis of both types, but the writings of the Romanist Modernists as well as the remarkable book by the American, Dr. Newman Smyth, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, published in 1908, helped to stress it. As a consequence, English Modernism, which aims at a synthesis of Liberalism and Catholicism, has arisen. This synthesis is entirely in harmony with the genius of the English Church.

The English Modernist believes much more in the Church than did his predecessors. It is for him "the Beloved Community." Separation from it means serious loss; and no Modernist dares create a new Christian sect. He believes that he must labour in the Church until he be cast out, and that he must never leave it on his own initiative. Yet while in the Church, it is his duty, in spite of opposition, to promote reforms which, while securing progress and efficiency, will not break continuity with the past.

The English Modernist places a higher value on the Sacraments than did the Liberal Churchman. He interprets them both dramatically and mystically.

Their reverent use in his experience unites him with past generations of fellow Churchmen, and also provides him with an ideal means of communion with the spiritual world. Thus for him the Sacraments are not merely prescribed rites or bare symbols — they afford the opportunity for sharing in unifying and uplifting spiritual experiences, and so become, when rightly used, the means of a spiritual discipline.¹

The English Modernist's criticism of the New Testament is more strictly critical than was the Liberal's. Presuppositions, if not altogether excluded by the Modernists, are at least more rigorously kept in check. Although the conclusions of the extreme eschatologists with their *Interims-Ethik* are for the most part not accepted by English Modernists,² yet Modernists find Jesus less familiar in some ways and less comprehensible than the Son of Man of German Protestant Liberalism. He is assuredly the Messiah of Israel, who gave His life to advance the Kingdom of God, — a figure full of majesty and mystery, — but He is also the Living Head of the Christian Church.

¹ Miss Alice Gardner in her book, *The History of Sacrament* (1921), brings out clearly the Modernist attitude to the Sacraments.

² Miss Lily Dougall's and C. W. Emmet's *The Lord of Thought* is a vigorous and in some measure successful attack on the eschatologists. Dr. R. H. Charles, an unrivalled authority on Jewish and primitive Christian eschatology, also disagrees with Schweitzer, as does also Canon B. H. Streeter, whose recent work on the criticism of the Gospels has placed him in the front rank of English New Testament scholars. After Schweitzer's book, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, became known in England, the ecclesiastical use of the word Liberal came to mean among younger scholarly Churchmen little more than anti-eschatological.

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 37

To sum up in general terms. The tendency of the older English Broad Churchmanship or Liberalism was to be rationalistic and *a priori*, individualist and negative, unemotional and undevotional, unsacramental and anti-ecclesiastical, Erastian and academic. It regarded Christianity as a religion of illumination and good conduct. Its approach to Christianity was philosophical or ethical rather than religious and mystical. The tendency of English Modernism is scientific and historical; its ideal of religion is mystical and social. Christianity is for it a growing spiritual experience, deepened, strengthened, purified, by worship and obedience—a religion both of redemption and of illumination. The Modernist values the Church but he does not value it for its authority as does the Catholic, because the supreme authority for the Modernist is not that of the Church but of the Spirit. He values the Church for its social life, its accumulated and treasured spiritual experience, the inspiration of its historic continuity, and its missionary potentiality. The Church is for him the chief agent for extending the Kingdom of God on earth; the principal *organon* through which the process of the Divine Incarnation operates in human history.

These two antithetical descriptions of Liberalism and Modernism are not to be pressed too closely. They are relative, not absolute. They portray tendencies chiefly. There are many exceptions in fact. They do not bring out sufficiently the great liberal contribution to English religious life. There is, for instance, the warm emotional social sympathy of

F. D. Maurice and Charles Kingsley and the early Christian Socialists; of Canon Barnett and his wife and their magnificent University settlement movement; there is the spiritual presentation of Christianity which we owe to Robertson of Brighton and T. H. Green; there is the practical Christianization of the English public-school system which we owe to Dr. Arnold and those he inspired, like Thring of Uppingham. Liberalism blends into Modernism: they are stages in one movement, not two distinct movements; and Modernism is in certain respects an enrichment of Liberalism an enrichment derived from Catholic sources. Without English Liberalism there would have been no English Modernism — and the saints of English Liberalism, such as Dr. Arnold of Rugby, Robertson of Brighton, F. D. Maurice, Charles Kingsley, Benjamin Jowett, Thomas Hughes, Dean Stanley, Bishop Colenso, Bishop Perceval of Hereford, Bishop Westcott of Durham, Professor Hort, are also the saints of Modernism. The poets of Liberalism, Alfred Tennyson, Arthur Clough, Matthew Arnold, Robert Browning, S. T. Coleridge, are also its poets. It draws inspiration and strength from them. If Modernism be richer, if it be more comprehensive, if it have advanced further than did the Liberal Churchmen, it is because it has added something of its own earnings and experience to the treasures it has inherited from its great Liberal predecessors.

What I have said will, I hope, make clear the relationship of English Modernism to the Broad Churchmanship and Liberal Churchmanship which

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 39

preceded it. The designation Modernist was adopted very slowly. Strong objection was felt to its use by Dean Inge and others, because it was thought that it might suggest what was very far from being the case — that the English Modernists held the same views as the Roman Modernists. Almost all who accept the designation recognize that it is not ideal; but if it be their fate to be labelled, — and it is the lot of the members of the different schools in the English Church to bear labels, — then Modernist is to be preferred to-day to either Broad Churchman or Liberal Churchman. At any rate, we have no choice: Modernist is the term by which both the Anglo-Catholics and English Roman Catholics designate us, and they attach various sinister significations to it. Fr. Ronald Knox's Modernist's Prayer is good example of this.

O God, forasmuch as without Thee,
We are not able to doubt Thee,
Help us all by Thy grace,
To teach the whole race,
We know nothing whatever about Thee.

Mr. Harold Anson, in a recent article in the *Hibbert Journal*, relates that a correspondent wrote to him after he had been lecturing: "I hear you are a Modernist." He wrote back: "What is a Modernist?" The answer came: "I cannot find out exactly, but I'm told it is worse than anything."

The designation has one great advantage. It is a flag and, as a Frenchman remarked, "*Un drapeau, qu'on cache dans sa poche, ce n'est pas un drapeau,*

c'est un mouchoir." The label Modernist is like "the white plume of Navarre" — he who wears it is immediately recognized both by his friends and by his foes. Timid men avoid it, for it is to-day in religious circles the most unpopular of our labels and the one most open to misrepresentation. It was used of us as the equivalent of Broad Churchman and Liberal Churchman by Mr. Hubert Handley in the Preface to *Theological Room*¹ at least as early as 1914. By that time also Canon Sanday had publicly announced his conversion to "a sound and right Modernism." C. W. Emmet used it in the same sense in his book *Conscience, Creeds and Critics*, published in 1918. Professor Percy Gardner who had protested in the *Modern Churchman* of April, 1911 (page 17), against the use of "the Graeco-Roman hybrid word Modernism" to characterize certain tendencies at work in the English Church, accepted it later when President of the Churchmen's Union for the following reasons:

It is not easy to find a name for the modern broad school. The term *liberal* has predominantly a political meaning. The term *broad* may indicate mere laxity and indifference. The term *modernist* also is unsatisfactory, for what is modern is by no means always in the line of progress. And the Roman Curia has attached the term to a circle of beliefs which seldom, if ever, was found in the mind of a single thinker: it has created a sort of clothes-horse on which to hang any views which it regards as dangerous. But we must reflect that nearly all

¹ Published in 1914, but one paper (see p. 23) dated 1905, contains it. It may here be due to a later correction.

MODERNISM AND ITS PREDECESSORS 41

party-names were originally the invention of enemies, including the name Christian, and we may hope to rescue the term Modernist from ignoble use.

In 1919 the leaders of the Modern Churchmen's Conference accepted the designation when, in gratitude to the authorities of Girton College, Cambridge, for their hospitality, they presented to that place of sound learning a small silver chalice with the inscription,

1918 *Ex dono hospitem modernistarum* 1919.

Some of our school, and not least the editor of the *Modern Churchman*, have tried to popularize the term Modern Churchman, but it has never been popular. It was probably too cumbersome. The Press preferred Modernist as shorter, and our Anglo-Catholic and Roman Catholic opponents preferred Modernist as more opprobrious. All we who are called Modernists can say of it is contained in the classical proverb: "Sparta is your lot, therefore adorn Sparta." To those who use it as an abusive and contemptuous epithet, we would commend the following statement by Canon Vernon Storr:

Modernism is a convenient missile to hurl at the head of someone whose opinions you do not like. But Modernism is only the altogether praiseworthy attempt on the part of a group of thinkers to present Christian truth in terms of modern knowledge. We do not to-day travel by coach, or wear jerkins, or speak the language of Chaucer, or believe that the earth is the centre of the solar system. Why in matters theological should we be forced to think in terms of bygone centuries? Woe be-

younger English Modernists, in his lucid and judicious volume, *The Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England*,¹ writes (pages 34, 35):

*The Church of England is comprehensive because the English Reformers gave it the widest basis any Church ever had. . . . The policy of the English Reformers was to secure a combination of ancient Catholic practice with reformed ideals; the English *via media* is not the result of a forced compromise, but of a union: a union in which the authority of the Bible, and the authority of the Church are both recognised and neither is regarded as excluding the other.*

One purpose of Mr. Richardson's book is to trace in the history of the English Church the steady evolution of the recognition of a third authority, the authority of the rational, moral, and spiritual consciousness, by which the authority of the Church and the authority of Scripture are brought into a unity. Such schools within the English Church as the Tudor Oxford Humanists, the Falkland Anglicans, the Cambridge Platonists, the eighteenth-century Latitudinarians, the nineteenth-century Broad Churchmen and Liberal Churchmen, the twentieth-century Modernists, have all been the advocates of this *tertium quid*, and have also been factors in the higher synthesis to which Anglicanism is steadily advancing.²

¹ Published by John Murray, 1923.

² I need hardly add that the Quakers and Unitarians have been powerful, if extreme, advocates of it in English Christianity, and gratitude is due to them.

Intellectual avidity and reverence for learning, moral and spiritual idealism, sensitiveness to aesthetic charm, the preservation of historic continuity, political sagacity which recognizes the value of comprehensiveness and compromise, respect for personal freedom, — in other words, respect for the rights of the governed, — the consciousness of the divine election of the nation, and the desirability of the Church's close relation to the State, have all blended and united to make the Church of England increasingly comprehensive and increasingly tolerant — not indeed from the outset, but progressively. In Tudor and Stuart times the Church of England was comprehensive but it was not tolerant. The existence of the Pilgrim Fathers testifies to its intolerance.

How great has been the advance in both comprehensiveness and tolerance during the last seventy years is demonstrated by C. W. Emmet, another of our English Modernists, in *Conscience, Creeds, and Critics*. In that volume he writes:

The advanced "unorthodox" view of one generation often becomes the accepted orthodoxy of the next. It is quite true there is chaff mingled with the wheat. The theories of no single school or writer are accepted in their entirety, nor are they admitted universally. But they come in time to be recognised as legitimate. The denial of verbal Inspiration, the right to interpret the Bible "like any other book," the questioning of the strict accuracy of some of its historical statements, the rationalising of some of its miracles, the recognition of the place of myth and allegory, the rejection of tradi-

tional views of the Atonement, of Eternal Punishment and Hell, the attempt to restate the Incarnation in terms of modern thought — modes of thought such as these are the commonplace of every theological student to-day. Even those who still fight against them would hardly urge that a clergyman who adopts them is bound to resign his orders. Yet, as we have seen, this was the cry with regard to each of these theories when it first came into prominence. They were regarded as the cloak for rank infidelity; the very foundations of Christianity and religion were being undermined.¹

I remember saying to a well-known English Unitarian: "Unitarianism is *doctrinally* broader than the Church of England, but to-day the Church of England is *practically* broader than Unitarianism." To this he assented. But may I add that the claim is not true if made for those branches of the Anglican Communion which are separated from the State, such as, for instance, the Anglican Churches of South Africa, New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and so on. It is true only of the Church of England. Let it not be supposed that in making this claim for the Church of England I desire to laud it over other communions. We owe much in England to our close relationship with the State and the Universities. Our ecclesiastical rulers have not been, in many cases, very brave; perhaps they have done best when they were cautious. Timidity has been their characteristic. There is a curious saying with some truth in it, — I do not know its origin, — *Episcopi Anglicani sunt semper pavidī*. (The English bishops are

¹ Emmet, *Conscience, Creeds and Critics* (Macmillan, 1918), p. 40.

always timid.) They kept the boat in the middle of the stream; they would not allow fools or fanatics to grasp the helm; the current, not they, carried her on towards the great ocean of truth, and freedom, and love. We are what we are as a Church, partly at least because we are what we are as a nation. Another of our English Modernists, the Venerable R. H. Charles has shown convincingly in the sixth chapter of his work *Between the Testaments* that the evolution of Israelite religion was due to that Church being coterminous with the nation: this allowed and, indeed, necessitated the existence of various schools within that Church, and their interaction and struggles for ascendancy made for both breadth and progress in the national religion. Had the English Church been a purely ecclesiastical body, like the Papacy or like the Baptists, it would never have retained and developed the religious values which it has done as a national Church.

"Three religions under one roof," as I once described the Church of England, may not contribute to a quiet life, but it certainly contributes to a spirit of practical compromise and a growing tolerance and common understanding. Moreover the house has to be continually extended, if it is to accommodate all the adherents of the "three religions."

My first point then is this, that the English Church is the ideal seed-bed of Modernism, and that Modernism will flourish and develop there, though it may have died in other Christian communions, or have grown up in them a sickly plant.

The Jesuit, George Tyrrell, saw that at the close

of his career. This comes out clearly in a remarkable statement of his cited on the title-page of Mr. Hubert Handley's *Theological Room*:

The position I have come to these last years is . . . one which an Anglican can hold honestly, but what a Romanist holds only by an equivocation. Any other sect ties you to a spot — Anglicanism gives you a wide range.

Granted, says the Traditionalist, that the Modernist has a rightful place in the Church of England; that is very far from proving that he has a rightful place in the Catholic Church of Christ.

Now my second point is this: that the Church of Christ is in its essential nature Modernist, and so the Modernist has a rightful place in it.

There are religions of the letter, like Judaism and Mohammedanism. Modernism has a difficult, although not impossible, task to domesticate itself in them. But Christianity is not a religion of the letter; it is not the religion of a book or of a legal code: it is the Religion of the Spirit. If it be asked, what Spirit? the answer is, the Spirit of God manifested in Jesus and given through Jesus, a Spirit of Truth and Freedom, of Faith, Hope, and Love. If Traditionalists could have recognized that this is the Church's deposit, — that deposit which it is the duty of the Church to preserve and propagate through the ages, and not a book, or a creed, or an organization, — how different would the history of the Church have been! All is subordinate and subsidiary to that. A curious Greek adjective, *πνευμα-*

τοφόρος (*Spirit-bearing*),¹ was used of the Church in primitive times. No adjective could have been more appropriate — it is truer than is Holy, or Catholic, or Apostolic as applied to the Church. I believe in the Spirit-bearing Church. The author of *Acts* tells in symbolical language (which he probably interpreted literally) how the Church was born by an outpouring of the Spirit, and the apostles inspired to begin their work of witnessing to Jesus by being the recipients of this outpouring. It is the Spirit which in the New Testament is the Creator of all the Church's institutions and possessions; her Ministry, Scriptures, Sacraments, her gifts and graces are all *charismatic* — the free gifts of the Spirit. The Spirit makes her a missionary Church and says: "Separate me Paul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have called them" (*Acts*, xiii, 1); and it is the same Spirit which directs their course; it is the Spirit which inspires the Church's prophets, who, with the apostles, are her two great ministerial orders in the first age. It is the Spirit which endows them with charismatic gifts for their office; and the result of their labours is to produce the fruits of the Spirit, "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control."² The writer of the Fourth Gospel is as clear on this point as St. Luke and St. Paul. He cites Jesus as declaring that His departure is a necessary preliminary for the

¹ If accented πνευματόφορος, it will mean Spirit-borne, but I favour πνευματοφόρος, on the analogy of Χριστοφόρος, Θεοφόρος, κ.τ.λ.

² *Galatians*, v, 22, 23.

Ministry of the Spirit — the Paraclete — in the Church and in the world.

If I go not away the Paraclete will not come unto you, but if I depart I will send Him unto you, and when He is come He will convict the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. . . . I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now, howbeit when He the Spirit of Truth is come He will guide you into all truth.¹

Then there is in the Fourth Gospel the mystical narrative of the Insufflation of the Apostles by the Risen Christ, perhaps the Johannine equivalent of the Lucan Pentecost:

He breathed on them and said unto them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them: whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.²

This narrative indicates that the Church's ethical standards are not to be looked for as enshrined in any legal code, but in the living voice of her inspired teachers. From age to age the preamble of the ever-developing New Law will run: "It seems good to the Holy Spirit and to us" (*cf. Acts*, xv, 28). The Christian apologetic will be equally inspired: "Feel no anxious care, it is the Spirit of your Father which shall speak in you," is the promise of Jesus.³

It is the same with the individual member of the Church as with the Church itself. The whole conception of the Christian life is life in the Spirit. "Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not obey the lusts

¹ John xvi, 7-13. ² John xx, 22. ³ Cf. Mark xiii, 11.

of the flesh." "As many as are led by the Spirit of God they are the Sons of God."

The reason why so many to-day do not see that the Church of the New Testament is a Church that is Spirit-born, Spirit-bearing, Spirit-guided, is because they read the New Testament in the light, or rather in the darkness, of a rigid traditionalism which presents the Church to them as a highly organized and intensely conservative and rigid institution with fixed Scriptures, fixed orders, fixed creeds, fixed rites, and fixed laws.

It is because the Modernist realizes the essentially spiritual character of the Church that he is compelled to be a Modernist. The Church, if it be what it ought to be, is the home of the Spirit of Love, of Truth, of Freedom. Bishop Creighton once said of some who seemed to him to press the claim for freedom too far: "They confuse the right of the individual to be free, with the duty of the institution to be something." St. Paul said truly: "With freedom did Christ set us free." The Modernist recognizes that there is danger in pressing the claims of freedom exclusively and absolutely: if they are pressed in that way, license and anarchy ensue and freedom is lost. The Christ of the Fourth Gospel promises His disciples: "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." The principle which guides and controls the English Modernist in his claim to freedom is this. *Freedom can be rightly claimed only for moral ends*: for instance, freedom may be claimed to seek and proclaim the truth; freedom may not be claimed so as to conflict with

the claims of love — the real good of the individual or the society. Any claim to a freedom which would defeat the purpose for which the Christian Church exists is unlawful. On the other hand, claims for freedom to realize the end for which the Church exists are always justifiable and needful, even though when first made they may be very unpopular and even bitterly persecuted in Church circles.

It may be objected that this is the teaching, not of Catholic Churchmen, but of Quakers; certainly it has much in common with them: both Quakers and Modernists believe in the authority of the Spirit. Where they differ is that the Quaker has no use for institutions, orders, sacraments, etc.; whereas, as I have pointed out, the Modernist believes them to be exceedingly useful; but their usefulness — like that of fire — will be found in keeping them under strict control. "Good servants, bad masters." The Modernist also believes in the Church — the Church in its most ideal form as presented in the *Epistle to the Ephesians* — as the Divine Society which is destined to unite all men in Christ; but while he recognizes the value of Scriptures, institutions, sacraments, orders, creeds, he regards them as all subordinate to the Spirit. The Spirit created them for spiritual ends and the Spirit can modify them, or create others to take their place as the need so requires; these "means of grace" have no absolute authority: their authority is dependent on their value to achieve the end for which they were created, and for which the Church exists, and if they do not do that they must be discarded or remade.

When the Traditionalist can recognize the Church to be what it essentially is, the Church of the Spirit, the Modernist and he will soon come to terms. Meanwhile, the Modernist claims with conviction and humility that he more truly has his rightful home in the Church of Christ than has his Traditionalist brother, whose rightful home is really the Synagogue.

V

THE CAUSES THAT CONVERT THE TRADITIONALIST INTO A MODERNIST

Men think they can do without religion; they do not know that religion is indestructible, and that the question simply is, Which will you have? — AMIEL.

It must be said that the question of the future of Christianity is the question of the future of religion. For what we have learned in the course of our wanderings through the history of religion is precisely this fact, that the Christian religion is absolutely superior to all other religions, and that Christianity represents the highest point which religious development has reached. — WILHELM BOUSSET.

You must not forsake the shippe in a tempest because you cannot keep down the windes. — SIR THOMAS MORE.

It is necessary to be clear as to the causes which convert Traditionalists into Modernists.

Modernists are often treated as if they were the cause of Modernism; they are not its cause, but its effect. They are compelled to become Modernists by their environment: compelled in certain cases against their inclinations and against their material interests. I have said they are compelled to become Modernists by their environment: that is hardly correct — it is but a part of the cause. What compels them is a growing knowledge of the truth which constitutes their environment — that New Truth which makes ancient good uncouth. Notice the phrase — “a growing knowledge of the truth.” There are many individuals who can live in the

presence of truth, whether new truth or old truth, and be quite uninfluenced by it, because they have no knowledge of it. Modernism is the outcome of an education which makes them acquainted with New Truth. But even knowledge of New Truth is not enough to make a Modernist. I have known men — clergymen in some cases — who had a large knowledge — a very large knowledge — of the New Truth in their environment, but they were not Modernists. They remained Traditionalists or Mediævalists or Fundamentalists. Why? Because they were afraid of the New Truth. It seemed to them destructive. It seemed to threaten ruin to all they loved — especially to their religion and their church. There it lay — the New Truth — like some gruesome skeleton in a cupboard. One could not forget its existence, but one dared not talk of it. If one did, one might be accused of murder, or be thought to be not quite “safe.” It seemed best to remain a Traditionalist, even if to do so one had also to be a sophist. To be a Modernist it is not needful merely to know the New Truth, but to be resolved to use it, and that demands that one should have faith in it. There are many Modernists who know the New Truth and are resolved to use it, even although at present they do not quite know what use to make of it.¹ But although a man may know the New Truth, and have faith in it, and be sure that it has a good use, he may not be a Modernist, he may be, and most

¹ Professor Paul Sabatier notes that in the Roman Catholic seminaries the Modernists were not only more intelligent but also more moral and more virile than their fellows.

often is, an Agnostic. Besides knowing and trusting New Truth there is something else that is needful, and that is that the man should believe in religion, and not simply in religion for himself, but in religion for humanity. To be a Modernist one must have the conviction expressed by Bernard Shaw's dictum in *Back to Methuselah*: "Civilisation needs a religion as a matter of life and death." Our present existing civilization needs a religion to save it, and by *saving* it, I mean much more than *salving* it — I mean making it sound and healthy, — giving it life, fullness of life, — the noblest and best.

The essence of religion is "humble dependence upon the Supreme Source of all Good" (to use a phrase of the late Professor Blackie of Glasgow), and coöperation with it — a source, as Rabelais has said, "whose centre is everywhere and whose circumference nowhere," but with which human souls can get into conscious contact preëminently through Christ, and from which they can derive a strength and an enlightenment which make them pure, patient, humble, hopeful, persevering, and courageous. But this individualist love of religion is not sufficient to make a Modernist: one may have it and be a Liberal Christian — a Liberal Protestant. To be a Modernist something more is needful than knowing and valuing Truth; something more than loving Religion and valuing it; one must also love and value a Beloved Community, — a community which enshrines our moral and spiritual ideals for humanity, — and that community is for the Modernist our "dear city of Zeus," our *civitas*

Dei — the historic Church of Christ. To be a Christian Modernist one must be convinced that our civilization needs not only the Christian Religion, but also the Christian Church. Probably the historic Christian Church seems to the Modernist to enshrine Christ's ideals very imperfectly. If so, it will be his duty as a Modernist to strive to make it embody them more perfectly, but he may not sever himself from its membership, or believe that the Christian Religion can dispense with the Christian Church — the Body of Christ, as St. Paul calls it.

VI

MODERNISM AND NEW TRUTH

The foundations of "religious knowledge" have often been shaken because they have been laid on the shifting sands of obsolete philosophy, unauthenticated tradition, and incompetent authority.

—WILLIAM DANKS.

WHAT is this New Truth which is the cause of Modernism?

It is so enormous in range that it seems almost grotesque to attempt to summarize it. It is needful, however, to indicate its existence in so far as it bears upon those problems with which traditionalist Christianity is faced.

Canon J. M. Wilson, a leading English Modernist, a Senior Wrangler at Cambridge in the fifties of last century, but still alive and teaching, writes in a volume of essays on Evolution published this year:¹ "I was already the science master at Rugby School in November, 1859, when Darwin's *Origin of Species* was first published." When J. M. Wilson was a boy, the general belief among English Christians was that this earth was brought into existence by a Divine fiat on a certain Tuesday in the year 4004 B.C. The sun, moon, and stars came into existence next day. For religious people the earth was still the

¹ *Evolution. A Collective Work*, published by Blackie and Son, 1925.

centre of the Universe, its most significant spot; and the history of the earth extended back less than 6000 years. This was Bible truth. It is true that the Copernican astronomy had already been accepted in the scientific world, but its implications had not been accepted in the religious world.

Earlier in the nineteenth century the geologists under Sir Charles Lyell had begun their researches, but here also the religious outlook was not really affected by them. The Church got its geology from *Genesis*, and although Charles Kingsley might passionately refuse to believe that God had written "one great and superfluous lie" on the face of the rocks, his fellow Churchmen saw nothing to protest about, for they were sure that *Genesis* and geology were in agreement, but if not, then so much the worse for geology.

Then there came Darwin and the evolutionists, and here the English Church took serious alarm, for it seemed clear to almost all Christians that the Darwinians, by claiming a brute ancestry for man, thereby denied his Divine ancestry. An English Prime Minister, the contemporary of many still living, the great Disraeli, diplomatically supported the Traditionalists by declaring himself to be "on the side of the angels."

Moreover, in the estimation of many, both scientists and ecclesiastics, Evolution — the outcome of natural selection and the struggle for existence — seemed to dispense with the need for a Creator. Nevertheless the evolutionary biologists prevailed. Man was proved to be the product of a biological

process beginning with protoplasm, in which it is impossible to detect either rational or moral consciousness. The proof concluded by showing him to be allied to the apes by the possession of a common ancestry. The religious opponents of Evolution were driven from the field. The chronology and Divine fiat of *Genesis* were as a consequence withdrawn from the sphere of science and history into the impregnable fortress of allegory or religious myth. The ark of Jehovah was carried forth no more to battle against the Philistines — at least, not in England.

The evolutionary biologists in their warfare with the Traditionalists received the support of the palæontologists, and we must also add the support of the mathematically minded Bishop Colenso, who, "possessed," as it seemed to his episcopal contemporaries, "with an evil heart of unbelief," did "with the glee of a fiend" cast doubt upon the arithmetic of the Old Testament; but his mathematics proved to be child's play compared to the mathematics of the physicists, who now made their contribution to New Truth, and as a consequence, in those early days of the Reign of Science the biologists strove with the physicists as to whether this planet was fifty million years old or a hundred million — a claim which has been greatly expanded since then.

Meanwhile, the astronomers who accepted the view that the earliest stage of the physical universe was that of a superheated gas whirling round in space had enormously extended by millions and

millions of miles the extent of the stellar universe, and by means of the spectroscope had discovered that the "stuff" which composed the most distant stars comprised the same elements as the earth. The earth was now proved to be one of the least of little stars, and it seemed hard to believe that the whole physical universe, as *Genesis* suggested, had been brought into existence solely to prepare for the advent of man.

What a tremendous addition had been made to human knowledge! Time had been rolled back an incalculable number of millions of years. Creation had been unveiled as a process extending through an almost infinite past, and promised to extend to an equally distant future: the τὰ πάντα ῥεῖ ("all things flow") of the ancient Greek thinker replaced the Hebrew cosmology, and an English poet put the New Astronomy into a verse which infant lips might learn by rote:

Worlds on worlds are hastening ever
From creation to decay
Like the bubbles on a river,
Sparkling, bursting, borne away.

With Pasteur the biology of the almost infinitely little arrived to contribute its offering of New Truth. The "Nature red in tooth and claw" of the zoölogists was now seen to be but a pale reflection of the terrific strife of the microscopic under-world of microbes. Man, whom Darwinism had shown to himself to be "a walking menagerie," was further revealed to possess a body made up of millions of

living cells each of which conceivably possesses some degree of consciousness.¹

The reply of the Gadarene demoniac, "My name is Legion for we are many," seemed, at first sight, in the light of this New Truth, to be the only fit description of such a being as man, and yet not fit, for each normal human being is also a unity governed by a hegemonic principle, explain it how we will.

Then, after the physics of the almost infinitely great came the physics of the almost infinitely little. The electrical theory of matter took the place of the old conception of it, and solid substances were transmuted into electrical units.² The dissolution of the material universe which had been achieved at an earlier stage by the logic of the idealist metaphysicians, was now demonstrated experimentally by the researches of the physicists. Matter as the older scientists understood it had ceased to exist. Possibly it consisted only of strain in the ether. The following citation from a recent essay by Professor Eddington, an eminent English physicist, indicates in popular language the physical aspect of the Universe as it is viewed by modern science.

The learned physicist and the man in the street were standing together on the threshold about to enter a room. The man in the street moved forward without trouble, planted his foot on a solid unyielding plank at rest before him, and entered.

¹ See W. R. Inge, in *Science, Religion, and Reality*, p. 371.

² It was my privilege to hear Sir Oliver Lodge deliver the Romanes Lecture at Oxford which first brought this home to the educated English world.

The physicist was faced with an intricate problem. To make any movement he must shove against the atmosphere, which presses with a force of fourteen pounds on every square inch of the body. He must land on a plank travelling at twenty miles a second round the sun — a fraction of a second earlier or later the plank would be miles away from the chosen spot. He must do this whilst hanging from a round planet head outward into space, and with a wind of ether blowing at no one knows how many miles a second through every interstice of his body. He reflects too that the plank is not what it appears to be — a continuous support for his weight. The plank is mostly emptiness: very sparsely scattered in that emptiness are myriads of electric charges dashing about at great speed, but occupying at any moment less than a billionth part of the volume which the plank seems to fill continuously. It is like stepping on a swarm of flies. Will he not slip through? No, if he makes the venture, he falls for an instant, till an electron hits him and gives a boost up again; he falls again, and is knocked upwards by another electron; and so on.¹

The effect on some minds of this new presentation of the Universe by modern science reminds one of a scene in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. As Christian and Pliable were wallowing in the Slough of Despond, Pliable cried out:

"Ah! neighbour Christian, where are you now?"

"Truly," said Christian, "I do not know."

But though the New Truth had disposed of the Biblical science, indeed, of the whole Biblical *mise-*

¹ Eddington, *Science, Religion, and Reality* (Sheldon Press, 1925), p. 189.

en-scène, the Biblical religion remained: but this also was destined to suffer a series of rude shocks in the light of fresh discoveries. It was said that in the sixteenth-century Renaissance, Greece rose from the dead with the New Testament in her hand. In the nineteenth-century Renaissance, it might be said with equal truth that the ancient East rose from the dead with the Old Testament in her hand. First, the Egyptian hieroglyphics were deciphered, and ancient Egyptian civilization rose from the dead; next, the cuneiform and Sumerian scripts were deciphered, and the civilization of Mesopotamia rose from the dead; then, William Robertson Smith, in his *Religion of the Semites*, caused the primitive Semitic religion of Syria, Palestine, Carthage, and Arabia to rise from the dead.

This new knowledge threw much light on the Old Testament. It provided it as a literature with its historic background, and by rendering possible the rearrangement of its constituent documents in their chronological order, it revealed the development of the Religion of Israel, and showed moreover how closely its creation and flood myths, its ethnology, its sacrificial system, its theocratic laws and institutions were related to those of the ancient Semitic world. It made it a new book truly, but what about its Divine origin and infallibility? Was it any more Divine than the sacred books of any other race? and, if so, in what precise sense?

Then the anthropologists, like Tylor, Lubbock, Boyd Dawkins, and their successors, began to make contributions to the New Truth, and so palæolithic

man and neolithic man, and the religious and social life of the most ancient of uncivilized and pre-historic peoples rose from the dead.

Then there came Max Müller and the students of Comparative Religion, and the ancient religion and civilization of the Aryan peoples were uncovered, and in due course there followed the fifty volumes of *The Sacred Books of the East*, and those admirable scientific monographs on religion known as the Hibbert Lectures. Religion now became a definite department of scientific study. Professorships in European universities were established to promote it — but they were not filled with priests and ministers of religion. The successive volumes of Sir James Frazer's encyclopædic contribution began to appear. The religious customs and beliefs of the most primitive savages were investigated and recorded. While commercially minded Belgian officials, in their efforts to secure rubber, were exterminating the native inhabitants of the Congo, Belgian *savants* were striving as eagerly to investigate the religion of the victims of Belgian colonial policy before they disappeared from the primæval forest.

As a result of these manifold labours in the sphere of Comparative Religion, the unity of the whole religious world stood revealed; but who could claim that it had originated from a primitive monotheism? Indeed, it was plain that ethical monotheism represented not the earliest but only the latest stage of religious evolution.

Meanwhile, scholars had been investigating the

origin and early history of the Christian Religion, and as a consequence the traditional belief in the infallibility and historical accuracy of the sacred writers of the New Testament had to be surrendered. The writers in question were proved to be subject to *tendencies*, that is, to certain dominant ways of thinking, which, unless discounted, reduce their value as scientific historians. Even articles of faith taken from Scripture and enshrined in the primitive Baptismal creeds, mainly in opposition to a dualist and docetic Gnosticism, were shown to be of doubtful historicity. Historical research further demonstrated that primitive Christianity was not so pure as good Protestants had supposed. A number of the beliefs and practices of the early Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Church were proved, so far as it is possible to prove such things historically, not to have originated with its Founder, but to be the products of Jewish speculation and pagan environment. This was particularly the case with much early Christian eschatology: its great assize of judgment, its resurrection of the dead, its heaven and hell. All the frame-work of the picture was Jewish, some of it possibly derived from Zoroastrian sources.

Then there came the contribution of the psychologists to New Truth. It is not easy at this stage to estimate this contribution, which promises to become increasingly important. William James and Starbuck came to Christian teachers as angels of light; Freud and Jung as foul fiends from the nether-world. Yet even the latter are being treated respectfully by Christian teachers, for had not both Arch-

bishop Temple and Amiel, with prophetic foresight predicted the coming reign of psychology?¹ And no one desired to reject a future deliverer even though his garments smelt strongly of brimstone, and his Gospel of *libido* seemed to cut at the roots of Christian morality. Nevertheless this New Psychology threatened to deprive man of his freedom, his morality, and his spiritual world at one fell swoop. On the other hand there were compensations in the contribution of psychotherapy. It restored to not a few, not only their health, but also their New Testament. The Gospels recorded miracles of healing wrought by means of psychotherapy: therefore, it was argued, the Gospels must be true.

Last, but perhaps not least, inscribed so indistinctly that some read the labels as New Truth and others as Old Error, came contributions from the departments of telepathy and psychical research, and it seemed to be becoming increasingly true of civilized man what Huxley had said of savage man: "There are savages without God in any proper sense of the word, but there are none without ghosts."² Psychical research seemed to provide not only a basis of fact which rendered credible the substance of the New Testament Resurrection narratives, but also the doctrine of a future life.

¹ "Our theology has been cast in a scholastic mode, i. e., all based on logic. We are in need of, and we are being gradually forced into, a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain: but nothing can prevent it." —

ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE (1857).

"The removal of Christianity from the historic to the psychological realm is the great need of our time." — AMIEL.

² *Lay Sermons and Addresses*, p. 163.

Now this is a very meagre summary of the contribution to New Truth made during the life-time of some who are still with us, but it is sufficient to indicate the enormous quantity of this New Truth and its tremendous significance for traditionalist Christianity.

Not a little of this New Truth, is, as I have indicated, in acute conflict with the Old Truth of Christian Traditionalism. Yet almost all educated men who have really grasped the nature of the evidence for these new conclusions, have found it necessary to accept them.

But how to understand and interpret these new conclusions in a form which will *not* deprive human life of its noblest values; how to make them square with current Christian beliefs; how to harmonize them with the Christian scheme of salvation; how to get the authorities of the Church of England to modify and reinterpret that Church's formularies so as not to come into conflict with assured scientific results — that is the problem for the Modernist, and he hopes to solve it practically. His working hypothesis is that ultimately the fundamental affirmations of the Christian faith will be found to be not incompatible with the discoveries of modern research. This working hypothesis demands a searching and fearless examination of the Christian faith in order to ascertain what are its essential affirmations.

VII

SOME FUNDAMENTAL POSTULATES OF MODERNIST APOLOGETIC

Reason can, and it ought, to judge, not only of the meaning, but also of the morality and evidence of revelation.

— BISHOP BUTLER.

Physical science is no more atheistic than it is materialistic.

— T. H. HUXLEY.

Evolution, whatever its extent, is not a Cause, nor even a Force, but a Method, which might be the path, either of a voluntary cause, or of a blind force, and has nothing to say to the controversy between them. — MARTINEAU.

DR. ERNEST BARNES, the present Bishop of Birmingham and a Fellow of the Royal Society, has hailed as the father of English Modernism the late Professor F. J. A. Hort of Cambridge. His particularly Modernist contribution is to be found in the Appendix to his Hulsean Lectures published posthumously in 1893. Hort asserts there, and I think all English Modernists would agree with him, that Christian theology must be prepared to face:

Two ultimate positions, not proved, but likely to be true:

(1) In the past — Man, with his whole mental and spiritual nature, is derived through various steps from lower beings having no such nature, and those probably in turn from inorganic bodies.

(2) In the present — Man's whole mental and spiritual nature is conditioned by his physical nature

and its pathological states, no mental or spiritual movement taking place without a concomitant physical movement.

These two positions, as Hort points out, contribute nothing to the proof or disproof of the existence of God: and they contribute nothing to the proof or disproof of immortality.

The acceptance of the first of them means the acceptance of evolution as the Divine creative method, and the abandonment of instantaneous creation by successive Divine fiat. It entails the acceptance of the fact that the creative process is still proceeding. This view, although it seems modern, appears to underlie the theology of the Fourth Gospel. Such a statement as that attributed to "the Word made flesh," "My Father worketh hitherto (even until now) and I work" (*John*, v, 17), is in harmony with the evolutionary conception of creation, as also such a passage as that in the 8th chapter of St. Paul's *Epistle to the Romans*:

For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us, for the creation with outstretched head awaits the revelation of the Sons of God . . . for we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in birth-pangs together until now.

The acceptance of the first of Hort's two positions means accepting as fact man's brute ancestry. It does not, however, entail the regarding of man as a brute. Man is not to be judged of in the light of his origin: Aristotle's great saying, "The nature of a

thing is that which it is when its becoming is completed," teaches us to look forward not backward if we would value any living thing correctly. This is as much to be practised in our judgment of the significance and worth of the creative process as of man himself. Of both the creative process and man we can say, "It doth not yet appear what they shall be"; but to judge by the various stages of the process up to the present, and the steadily improving quality of the product, the process itself looks extremely promising. There is nothing here to prevent us viewing man as a potential Son of God. Professor Lloyd Morgan, whose faith in "emergent evolution" makes him regard its "whole sweep" as due to "Spiritual Agency,"¹ and Professor J. S. Haldane, who has emphasized that the lower stages of the creative process must be judged in the light of the highest stage, leave the Christian Hope undimmed.

The acceptance of Hort's second position by the Christian theologian will seem to some to involve him in determinism, materialism, and pessimism. It need not do so if we keep in mind that evolution is a creative method, not a creative cause, and that, as Lord Balfour and Professor James Ward have demonstrated, we do not by any means know sufficient of the Universe to necessitate either the determinist, or materialist, or pessimist, hypotheses as interpretations of the creative process.

Professor J. S. Haldane in his invaluable book *Mechanism, Life, and Personality* asks:

¹ *Evolution in the Light of Modern Knowledge*, Blackie and Son, 1925.

What, for instance, of the history of the individual person? Was there not a time when, within his mother's womb, he had no conscious existence? And how did his individual personality come into being? Not only his bodily form, but all his moral and intellectual characteristics are inherited from or through his parents. Is not, therefore, his personality the mere outcome of material or purely organic conditions? Is not this rendered certain by the known fact that some organic defect — for instance, in his thyroid gland — may make him an idiot?

In practical life we must often, perforce, satisfy ourselves with such reasoning: but there is a *petitio principii* running through it all. It is the same *petitio principii* that runs through the whole materialistic conception of the universe. We as yet know nothing of the psychology of the foetus or the individual cell, just as our forefathers knew nothing of the physiology of the living cells which they mistook for mere drops of colloid material. We also know extremely little about what we call matter, though we do know enough about our ignorance of it to enable us to reject an argument based on the assumption that our ignorance is knowledge.

Equally, Christian Theology must, so the Modernist believes, accept the Copernican universe of our astronomers, even as presented by Einstein's general theory of relativity, which reveals the curvature of space and time. That acceptance must entail the dissolution of a geocentric theology. It is exceedingly difficult to conceive that the astronomical universe was created for the sake of this earth or that this earth has alone been the home of rational, moral, and spiritual creatures. The writings of Sir

Alfred Wallace and possibly Professor Jeans may seem to give support to a geocentric theology, but in view of what we know of the Universe it seems very frail support indeed. Let it suffice for us that the creative process is what it is on this planet, but let us not think of ourselves as the only creatures who are, as the result of that process, potential sons of God. M. Camille Flammarion seems to have strong scientific justification — even though it be an unverified hypothesis — for saying: “There are cradles and graves out yonder”; and for aught we know, crosses also, whereon Sons of God yield up their breath — for it is hard to imagine a social life of moral and spiritual beings into which vicarious sacrifice does not enter. Our Christian Theology of the future will wisely refrain from presenting the Divine Creator as solely concerned with humanity and the mysteries of sin and salvation on this planet. Such a change need entail no concessions to materialism. Quality not quantity counts in this universe, as Pascal urged in the seventeenth century. The microscopic being who *knows* he is crushed is infinitely greater than the unknowing mass, however vast, which crushes him. I venture again to quote Professor J. S. Haldane — the passage sticks in the memory. He writes:

The astronomer or the physicist seems, at first sight, to be presenting to us a gigantic and absolutely inhuman universe, in which man and human activity is but a tiny speck. Most people simply shut their eyes to this picture in its entirety. Few have the courage to face it.

But it was faced by the philosophers of the eighteenth century. Hume pointed out that there is one all-important element in the picture, which most people leave out of account, and this is that the picture is only a picture. Kant and his successors taught us to see in part how the picture is painted, and to realize that it is only one expression of human personality — the personality typified in the lonely and heroic figure of Copernicus. Those who have read Heine's *Deutschland* will remember his account, scintillating with the flashes of his wonderful literary genius, of Immanuel Kant, whom he represented as the Robespierre of an intellectual revolution far more wide-reaching in its effects than the French Revolution. The victim of this intellectual revolution was pictured as no mere earthly king, but the God of Hebrew and Christian tradition. "I can hear the bell. Kneel down. They are bringing the sacraments to a dying God." Heine was right in his estimate of the importance of Kant's work. But it was the God of materialism, and not of Christianity, that was dying.

Another thing that Christian theology must be ready to accept is all sound literary and historical criticism of its Scriptures, Creeds, Institutions. There has been a readiness to do this in part. Traditionalism in England has largely admitted the truth of the picture which Old Testament literary and historical criticism presents of the origin and evolution of the Religion of Israel; it has yielded in part to the critical results of New Testament studies and those of primitive Christianity, but it is far from having assimilated them. The Modernist is in agreement with Bishop Butler's aphorism: "Things are what they are, and their consequences will be

what they will be. Why then should we desire to be deceived?" Christianity is a historical religion — that is one reason why it triumphed over its rival mystery religions; but it can experience very considerable alterations historically without losing its character and power. Personally I do not stand altogether with Schweitzer and the eschatologists; still less do I stand with the Christ-myth school. I believe that our Synoptic Gospels present us with a picture of Jesus, His character, and deeds, and words, which is in the main historical. I believe we can truly say with Weinel: "As for Jesus, we know Him very well." Nevertheless, Modernist Theology is prepared to let historical criticism have full play. We must find our last reserves of strength and inspiration in the Spirit of Jesus rather than in the strict historicity of the wonderful Gospel cartoons.

Albert Schweitzer, who, as a very remarkable Christian, speaking from the fullness of a vivid Christian experience, deserves to be heard even more than when he speaks as a scholar, has written some words at the close of his *The Quest of the Historical Jesus (Von Reimarus zu Wrede)* which have weight and even prophetic power. He writes:

Jesus means something to our world because a mighty spiritual force streams forth from Him and flows through our time also. This fact can neither be shaken nor confirmed by any historical discovery. It is the solid foundation of Christianity.

History will force us to find a way to transcend history, and to fight for the lordship and rule of Jesus over the world with weapons tempered in a different forge.

But the truth is, it is not Jesus as historically known, but as spiritually arisen within men, who is significant for our time and can help it. Not the historical Jesus, but the Spirit which goes forth from Him and in the spirits of men strives for new influence and rule, is that which overcomes the world.

He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lake-side, He came to those men who knew Him not. He speaks to us the same word: "Follow thou me!" and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfill for our time. He commands. And to those who obey Him, whether they be wise or simple, He will reveal Himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings, which they shall pass through in His fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience Who he is.

Hort would I think support Schweitzer here. He writes:

Christianity is not a uniform and monotonous tradition, but is to be learnt by successive steps of life.

And of criticism he says two things with which every English Modernist would agree.

(1) Criticism is not dangerous save when it is merely the tool for reaching a result, believed on the ground of speculative postulates.

(2) There can be no surer sign of decrepitude and decay in faith than a prevalent nervousness about naming and commending reason.

There are two more canons of the Father of English Modernism which must not be omitted. I regard them as of profound importance.

It is vain to uphold either [on the one hand]

(1) a merely humanitarian theology: all study of nature dissolves it; an enlarged study of and care for humanity dissolves it hardly less;

(2) [or] on the other hand, a merely pantheistic theology in combination with a humanitarian morality or anthropology. Both the pantheistic and the humanitarian factors are needed in theology and in morality alike, and for the union of both. No evidences of the supermundane God can have any power if we fail to discern the radiations of transmitted and derivative deity as the luminous and vital tissue of finite things.

These are some of the fundamentals of English Modernism. But the supreme task of the Modernist is to get these principles admitted by the overwhelming mass of Traditionalists who seem to think that the Reformation or Pre-Reformation Theology is adequate for the modern world. To academic persons working in their studies and laboratories or lecturing to their students, it may seem an absurdly easy task to accomplish, as it may to people who know nothing about the ecclesiastical mind. The practical Modernist knows how incredibly hard it is, and what prolonged effort it must require.

A German general on the Western front has stated in his recently published memoirs that in every case, before he was able to fight the enemy, he had to fight the High Command. The Modernists believe themselves able to provide the Church with an apologetic with which the Church can win the English people to Christ; but so far the Modernists have had to contend with their traditionalist rulers

and brethren as a preliminary to getting their apologetic into action. Why, it may be asked, trouble about them? The answer is that nothing can be accomplished without their sympathy and consent. Those who are to be won by the Modernist apologetic have to be won, not merely, to the acceptance of a new outlook or new set of ideals, but to the acceptance of a religion which includes membership in a Church which believes, teaches, and practises that religion. If the Church remain rigidly traditionalist in its belief, in its teaching, in its services, in its policy, the efforts of the Modernist apologist are vain. His apologetic is useless; it is rendered so by the Traditionalist teachers who will not themselves use the new truth which the Church needs, or permit the Modernist to use it either. St. Paul had to contend with Judaizers and to defend his Gospel even in Jerusalem as a needful preliminary condition to establishing that Gospel in the Gentile world. Hence the second task of the Modernist after having forged a modernist apologetic is to modernize the spirit and policy of his church, that so new wine may be poured into new wine-skins, and both be preserved.

VIII

MODERNISM AND DOGMA

Die wahre Kritik des Dogma ist seine Geschichte.

— D. F. STRAUSS.

Some theologians define the nature of God Almighty with an accuracy from which modest naturalists would shrink in describing the genesis of a black beetle. — SIR LESLIE STEPHEN.

To cast down the statues of the gods is not always an act of unbelief — it is usually the proclamation of a higher conception of divinity. — PAUL SABATIER.

THE English Modernist's attitude towards dogma demands explanation. Some might suspect that his attitude towards dogma is hostile. This, however, is not the case. He recognizes the necessity for dogma. What the Modernist is opposed to is dogma which is false, dogma which is out of date and repels the modern-minded man and woman. The Modernist is also opposed to the exaltation of the ability to profess belief in dogmas into a Christian virtue of a high order. There is much about conduct in the Gospel-teaching of Jesus: much about the cultivation of certain types of character and temper; practically nothing which advocates as desirable the assent to intellectual propositions, or commends the intellectualist dogmatic type of Christian. In the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus asks no one to accept Him as Messiah: but He points out that those who call Him Lord are under obligations to practise what He

teaches. Those who do God's will stand to Jesus in the relation of brother, sister, and mother. The dogmas in the teaching of Jesus are so few and so practical that they can hardly be shown to exceed the following:

(1) That God is our Father, and if we try to do His will and act after His example, we can become His sons.

(2) That there is a Kingdom of God, and that to share in this Kingdom is the *summum bonum* of human existence. This kingdom is at hand.

(3) That Jesus Himself is the Messiah of the Kingdom of God, but He comes to serve not to reign; not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many.

The Modernist, in view of the simplicity of the teaching of Jesus, objects to any but very simple and fundamental dogmas being regarded as essentially Christian. He recognizes the danger which the Church suffers from the intellectualist Christian teacher who wishes to make his intellectual conclusions those of the Christian Church, and to insist on their being accepted by all Christians. It was this intellectual arrogance on the part of mediæval Schoolmen which aroused the opposition of John Colet, and it is the same temper which compels protest on the part of Modernists to-day. The seventeenth-century Bishop of Norwich, John Hall, said that the most useful of all books in theology would be one with the title *De paucitate credendorum*—"Of the fewness of the things that a man should believe." We ought to note the *should*. His Puritan contem-

porary Richard Baxter said: "The plague of the Church for above a thousand years has been the enlarging our Creed and making more fundamentals than God ever made." But I will cite three of our modern English bishops whose words carry weight. Bishop Lightfoot of Durham said:

There is nothing so dangerous as the desire to make everything right and tight, . . . I find that my faith suffers nothing by leaving a thousand questions open, so long as I am convinced on two or three main lines.

Bishop Boyd Carpenter of Ripon, addressing the Church Congress in 1898, predicted that

Christianity will be content with a simpler symbol, because it will have learnt Christ. It will not need any longer Trent or Westminster, Lambeth or the Vatican to lead it. It will be satisfied with simpler thoughts and a purer faith.

Dr. Diggle, Bishop of Carlisle, said what the history of intricate dogmatic controversy proves up to the hilt:

The more complex the Creed, the more it obscures the Christ.

Yet because the Modernist believes in continuity in the Christian Church, even as he believes in truth, and freedom, and comprehensiveness, so he does not advocate the drastic and contemptuous rejection of those dogmas with which the orthodoxy of to-day is burdened. He advocates a particular attitude towards dogma which is neither that of the Traditionalist, who would retain all the ancient tra-

ditionalist dogmas unchanged, nor that of the extreme Liberal, who is hostile to dogma altogether, and rightly declares that what Christians need to stress is religion and not theology, conduct and not creed. The Modernist cannot avoid recognizing at the outset that the word dogma is repellent to modern ears. It suggests all that is narrow, hard, obscurantist, intolerant. Yet dogma need not mean and ought not to mean that. The word is Greek and had two meanings among the Greeks. It meant a decree by those in authority, as for instance in St. Luke's Gospel: "There went forth a decree [*dogma*] from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be taxed." It also meant the postulates or principles of a philosophical school—for example, the dogmas of the Stoics or Epicureans. Now it is obvious that in its second sense the Christian Religion must have dogmas, that is, principles or postulates which any loyal and reasonable Christian may be expected to accept. It was not a Traditionalist but a very progressive Liberal Christian, Auguste Sabatier, who said:

One cannot conceive either dogma without a Church, or a Church without dogma. The two notions are correlative and inseparable. . . .¹

A religion without doctrine, a piety without thought, a feeling without expression, these are things essentially contradictory."²

Let it be granted that the Christian Church must have dogmas. But must those dogmas be the dog-

¹ *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion*, English Translation, p. 229.

² *Ibid.*, p. 336.

mas which it at present possesses? Yes and no. The Modernist advocates a rigorous, open-minded, practical examination of our traditional Christian dogmas as a necessary and profitable undertaking on the part of our Church authorities. Some of these dogmas are essentially true and important and ought to be retained; others are false and ought to be rejected; others are unimportant and should not be insisted on; others are true, but are expressed in antiquated language, and need reformulation.

Christian dogmas can be divided roughly into three classes.

(1) First, there are what may be called *spiritual* dogmas. These are the axiomatic truths of the Christian life, such as that God is Love, Light, Truth, Spirit; that Jesus is in His character the reflection of the invisible Father — the Very Word of God in human history; that those who accept Jesus as their Lord and Guide receive the Spirit of Jesus, which is a spirit of love, joy, peace, holiness in their lives.

These are dogmas of supreme importance. Every human being, who is not blinded by lovelessness, sensuousness, and thoughtlessness, must wish them to be true when they are adequately presented to him. These spiritual dogmas of Christianity are like the Platonic ideas: they are recognized by the soul of man as true, and when once recognized, they can never be forgotten entirely. They are:

Truths that wake, to perish never;
Which neither listlessness, nor mad endeavour,
. . . Nor all that is at enmity with joy
Can utterly abolish or destroy.

These truths the Modernist regards as the great heritage of human ethical and religious evolution given to mankind in the religion of Jesus. They are essential to human progress. To let them slip will be to slide back into those gulfs of sensualism, naturalism, and superstition from which humanity is with so much stress and struggle emerging. How, it may be asked, are these dogmas to be proved to be true? The Modernist would answer, "By experience." These dogmas rest in the last resort upon the conviction that the creative process, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary, is essentially rational, moral, and spiritual. Whence do we get that conviction? We get it from ourselves. We, the highest and latest product of the creative process, know ourselves in our best moments to be rational, moral, and spiritual. We are also aware that only that which is rational, moral, and spiritual in the highest degree can satisfy us ultimately; we believe that that process which produced us is essentially in its aim and purpose, and so in its very nature rational, moral, and spiritual, and so can and will satisfy us ultimately. As that evolutionary process proceeds, these spiritual dogmas will be more and more evidently seen to be its guiding principles, the key to its interpretation. We, as we adhere to them, and strive to live by them, become more and more convinced that they contain the very essence of life, the very secret of existence; that noble, joyous, progressive, abounding life, whether personal or communal, is dependent upon putting them into practice, living as though they were true. These dogmas are the

essentials of Christianity, and the life of every Christian Church depends on its holding them fast and instilling them. The experience of the *anima humana naturaliter Christiana* constitutes their most convincing proof.

(2) The second class of dogmas is *historical*. Such dogmas as that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary, was crucified, dead, and buried, etc., that He rose from the dead on the third day. These dogmas are of less importance to the Christian Religion than the first class of dogmas. The Christian Religion might survive without them. They are not axiomatic moral and spiritual truths, neither are they provable by experience. Their proof is *historical*. Here Christians are in the hands of the higher critics and historians. What they decide at the bar of historical criticism, that the Christian Church must accept. If the Christian Church does not accept their decision, but yet continues to insist on the acceptance of these historical dogmas as a *sine qua non* of membership in the Church or of teachership in it, the Church will gradually lose from its ministry and membership all the historically minded, and will become the Church of the charcoal-burners until the charcoal-burners become educated.

The English Modernist sees this clearly and so has been urging the Church authorities to take the pressure off these historical dogmas. Modernist endeavours have not been without effect. A certain number of the English bishops would not to-day hesitate to ordain men who claimed complete freedom to accept the conclusions of historical criticism

in the case of these historical dogmas — as, for instance, the Virgin Birth and the physical resurrection of Jesus.

(3) The third class of dogmas are *scholastic* dogmas. They are an ecclesiastical inheritance from the speculations of Greek and Latin Fathers, Mediæval Schoolmen, and Protestant Reformers. They need careful investigation — some are sound, some unsound. They are of interest to theologians and to Christians with speculative minds. John Milton makes the fallen angels in hell, during such leisure as they can secure from their normal occupations of warring with heaven and tempting man, occupy themselves with the discussion of such subjects as

Providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,
Fixt fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute.¹

It is the controversies which have arisen over these speculative questions which have been the curse of the Church, as Longfellow shows in his picture of Salerno University (although I believe Salerno was mainly medical and not theological):

A land of wranglings and of quarrels
Of brains that seethe, and hearts that burn.

Satan as he contemplates it, comments in words worth remembering:

As long as the boastful human mind
Consents in such mills as these to grind,
I sit very firmly on my throne,

¹ *Paradise Lost*, bk. ii, 560.

Of a truth it almost makes me laugh
To see men leaving the golden grain
To gather in piles the pitiful chaff.

As regards these scholastic dogmas (ranging from the Dogma of the Trinity in Unity down to the nature of Baptismal Regeneration) the Modernist believes it to be undesirable to enforce them to-day on the authority of the past. All of them draw attention to some problem which has occupied the minds of Christians and which the Church authorities have decided in this particular way. The decision is not necessarily right or final, and certainly it ought not to be imposed with the weight of ecclesiastical authority, as if it were infallible.

The judicious Hooker in a noble passage has presented the Anglican position in this matter, and it is one with which the Modernist is in hearty agreement.

Now, it is not required, nor can be exacted at our hands, that we should yield unto anything our assent, than such as doth answer the evidence which is to be had of that we assent unto. For men to be tied and led by authority as it were, with a kind of captivity of judgment, and though there be reason to the contrary not to listen unto it, but to follow like beasts the first in the herd, they know not nor care not whither, this were brutish. Again that authority of men should prevail with men either against or above reason is no part of our belief. "Companies of learned men," be they never so great and reverend, are to yield unto reason; the weight whereof is no whit prejudiced by the simplicity of his person which doth allege it, but being found to be

sound and good, the bare opinion of men to the contrary must of necessity stoop and give place.¹

These scholastic dogmas are better left as open questions. It is a mistake to regard them as closed and settled forever. Robert Browning's warning especially applies here:

O! if we draw a circle premature,
Heedless of far gain,
Greedy of quick returns of profit sure
Bad is our bargain.

It is the setting of authority against the right to question, the making of enquiry a criminal rather than a laudable undertaking, which is the curse of the ecclesiastical dogmatic spirit, which loves closed doors with the notice exhibited, "Do not knock or ring the bell." Renan maintained that it was the growth of this spirit in the Christian Church, rather than the barbarian invasions, which had brought on the dark ages in Europe. The Modernist refuses to regard heresy as a crime or to encourage "the closed mind" or the temper of non-enquiry which would so regard it. As he scans the course of Church History he sees that the heretics were of two kinds — the small heretics and the great heretics. The small heretics were the Christian teachers who, when theology was moving, refused to move. They were the extreme conservatives who stood for the orthodoxy of the past — men like the Roman Adoptionists, who when the Catholic Church was moving from what is commonly called the primitive Adop-

¹ *Eccl. Pol.*, bk. II, ch. 7, par. 6.

tionist Christology of the Church of Jerusalem, stood where the Gospel of Mark, the Epistle of James, and Acts I-XII stand, and refused to move and also refused to reason. Arius comes in the class of the small heretics: his position was traditionalist conservative, although it belongs to a later stage of traditionalism than that of the Roman Adoptionists. He, however, did not decline to reason, but he reasoned very badly against the Modernist Athanasius. X

Then there are the great heretics. They were not conservatives or reactionaries like the little heretics, but men who, finding Christian theology and themselves faced by profound problems, attempted their solution with no little daring and originality. The Church authorities of the period refused to accept these solutions — and, this is most remarkable, refused quite rightly. Moreover, the Church condemned and excommunicated their authors. These men wear what Professor Paul Sabatier has called *l'auréole d'hæresiarque*. Such men were Marcion (most Christian of heretics), Basilides and the great Gnostics, Paul of Samosata and Sabellius, Apollinarius and Nestorius, and many of the teachers of the great school of Antioch and the missionaries who in the seventh century carried Christianity east even into China. Some would regard Origen and Pelagius, Johannes Scotus Erigena and Peter Abelard as coming in this class. In some cases the problems attempted to be solved, such as the relation of Spirit to Matter, and the Origin of Evil in the creative process, are possibly insolvable; in other cases

the problems like that of the relation of the Old Testament to the New, or of Jehovah to "the Father" of Jesus, were solvable, but the heretic's solution was on wrong lines.

But what the Modernist observes is the tremendous service to Christian Theology performed by these great heretics. The evolution of theology is due to them. They made the Traditionalists think. They saw defects and inadequacies in the Traditionalist theology—defects and inadequacies to which the Traditionalists themselves were blind and of the evil effects of which they were unconscious. The heresiarchs

. . . read each wound, each weakness clear,
They struck their finger on the spot
And said, "Thou ailest here, and here."

Then they prescribed remedies. The Church authorities, alarmed and irritated by having the defects of the traditional doctrine exposed, rejected the new views. But their rejection was not based on irritation: they perceived that the heretical solution entailed the loss of certain moral and spiritual values, and so they rejected it. Besides rejecting the solution, the authorities inflicted penalties on the heresiarch. This the Modernist condemns, although by many Traditionalists it is not condemned. I once heard a well-known Churchman, Canon McColl, declare in a sermon in Ripon Cathedral, that that fire was not misused which "reduced the all-too-busy brain of the heretic to ashes." The Traditionalist policy of inflicting penalties on heretics

intimidates Christian thought; it checks theological progress; it delays theological reformulation; it creates a spirit of scepticism among intelligent Churchmen. The heretic ought to be thanked even when his solution is rejected. He ought not to be anathematized and excommunicated. It is bad for the Church, and it is not pleasant for him. After all, he has done good service. He has provoked Christian thought, which is not so easily aroused as unchristian temper. How many of our greatest theological works are due to the provokings of heretics! We should have had no Butler's *Analogy* if it had not been for the Deists; and how much Butler's theology was modified, strengthened, and developed in confuting the Deists is an interesting speculation, not however usually discussed in introductions to the *Analogy*.

The other good service performed by the great heretics is to have led the Church to realize more intensely and clearly the spiritual and moral value of particular dogmas. This value determines the Modernist attitude towards any traditional dogma. The intellectual formulation of a dogma, he perceives, is secondary; the moral and spiritual value primary. No Christian dogma that possesses undoubted moral and spiritual values may be rejected, even although the Traditionalist formulation of it be shown to be unsatisfactory and open to serious intellectual objection. Take for instance the dogma of human Free-Will. There is, I conceive, no satisfactory intellectual formulation of it; but its opposite — Determinism — can be adequately formulated

intellectually. Yet because of its moral and spiritual values, the Christian Church cannot part with Free-Will, although the attempt was made in the Augustinian and Calvinist theologies, and, it must be admitted, with most deleterious moral and spiritual results, as we see, for instance, in such a popular presentation of it as Robert Burns's "Holy Willie's Prayer." In such a case the Church looks to the future to solve the problem intellectually, and points to the moral and spiritual loss which must follow on surrender. The belief in Freedom, like the belief in God, and the belief in Immortality, is a moral and spiritual fundamental.

The editor of the *Hibbert Journal* contributed to a recent number (July, 1925) a thought-provoking article with the title, "A Theology in Harmony with Modern Thought." The Modernist is convinced that a theology in conflict with modern knowledge is an impossible theology for a modern-minded man. "Facts are chieils that winna ding," says a Scotch proverb; and a theology, however venerable or authoritative, which contradicts or ignores facts must fail to win adherence in an age of prevailing scientific education; but Theology, although it is an inductive science, is more than an inductive science. The Christian saint who wrote *pectus facit theologum* uttered a profound truth. Imagination, aspiration, moral and spiritual needs, carry Theology forward over the scientific ridge, beyond the near horizon. Israelite prophets, New Testament seers, Christian mystics, ascend eminences whence they view the far horizon, and it is

these visions which contribute to the creation of a Christian theology. They are not modern and they are not antiquated — they never grow old — they are timeless and eternal. They cannot be justified intellectually on the basis of our present experience: modern knowledge cannot prove them to be true; they are not in entire harmony with modern thought, neither are they in conflict with it; they transcend it. They are the profoundest truths of the Christian Theology. Why does the Christian Church hold fast to them and contend for them? It is because they do two things.

First, *they conserve the highest values in life*, and they conserve them, as Professor Harald Höffding points out, "beyond the limits which experience exhibits and in spite of all the transformations which experience reveals."¹

Secondly, they promise an *augmentation of values*. There are dogmas which with the passage of the ages are seen to have increasing significance and value — for instance, such a dogma as the Incarnation.

The historic evidence upon which the Church believed the Incarnation was, much of it, false; its significance in many respects was misrepresented and misinterpreted: the Church held fast to the dogma, incredible and indefensible as it seemed in some respects. Why? Because it promised an augmentation of values in human life, as the triumphant note in Christmas and Easter Day services and hymns bears witness. Now we are getting to

¹ *Philosophy of Religion*, English translation, p. 216.

see its deeper and wider significance. The Incarnation is becoming in the minds of many the key to the interpretation of the evolutionary process.

The attitude of the Modernist toward those of the Church's dogmas which, although not in conflict with modern knowledge, are yet incapable of intellectual demonstration, is that of Arthur Hugh Clough, who, be it remembered, resigned his Fellowship at Oriel College, Oxford, because he was unable to accept some of the Church's dogmas *ex animo*.

Old things need not be therefore true,
O brother man, nor yet the new;
Ah! still awhile the old retain,
And yet consider it again!
The souls of now two thousand years
Have laid up here their toils and fears,
And all the yearnings of their pain,
Ah! yet consider it again.

Hence, the attitude of the Modernist towards dogma is different from that spirit which denies or despises. His attitude is one of sympathetic investigation, with the resolve to retain all that can usefully be retained. But he claims freedom to investigate as a Christian right, and also freedom to reject what is false, and that the exercise of freedom in both these matters is a very serious duty and one which may not be shirked by the Christian teacher. He would even urge that the gratitude of the Church is due equally to the Christian teacher who persuades it to reject old traditional error and to the Christian teacher who wins it to accept new truth. There is no need, with Procrustean rigour, to rack

and mutilate every dogma of the Christian faith, to make it fit in with every tendency and theory of the modern world; but there is need that those who feel that the Holy Spirit is speaking to men in this age through the events of history and discoveries of science should learn the means by which the new knowledge, if not rendered the handmaid of Theology according to the mediæval ideal, may at least prove to be her sister and her companion, and not her enemy.

This is the Modernist attitude toward Dogma. The Modernist is no *malleus theologorum*. We must have a theology, but a theology which will win the modern mind: a theology, too, which in its profoundest doctrines must be proved experimentally: a theology which is plastic and always open to reformulation: a theology which, if possible, shall be so simple and lucid that plain men can understand it. We must have a modern theology. The hour is overdue for its formulation.

Professor A. V. G. Allen, an American scholar of Christian dogmatics, who has shown, I venture to think, an insight into the significance of Christian Dogma surpassed by none, said at the conclusion of his work, *The Continuity of Christian Thought*, published as long ago as 1884:

The factors of a true theology are now in our possession as they have never been before in all the church's history — God, humanity, and nature, bound together in indissoluble relationship. The preparation begins to be approximately complete for undertaking the result which theology aims to achieve, — a science which shall embrace all knowledge, because it sees all things in God.

It is full time that a modern theology was not simply formulated by our Church authorities, but also presented to the faithful for their acceptance.

It has been pointed out that the Lollards made no real progress toward reforming the mediæval Church because they had no theology to place against the massive structure of St. Thomas Aquinas and his expositors. It was not until Calvin and Melancthon and Luther and Cranmer produced reformed theological systems that the Nordic races felt able to break the mediæval dogmatic shackles.

It may be, as M. Paul Sabatier says, that "Modernism is neither a party, nor a school, but only an orientation," but it cannot stop there. It cannot remain a disembodied spirit; it has to be incarnated, and to act and teach and, if needs be, be crucified and rise again. It must shortly produce a Modernist theology: criticism, negation, destruction are not enough, we must have dogmatic construction and reconstruction; criticism fails unless it be accompanied or followed by construction.

IX

MODERNIST RECONSTRUCTION

It needs no prophet to foresee that the time will come when ideas, which to-day are strange and unwelcome, will be seen to possess a beauty of their own, to be necessary to the completeness of truth, and to belong, no less than many which are long familiar, to the common treasury of the Kingdom of God. — H. B. SWETE.

IN the Great War, on the Western Front, in order to hold a position successfully, it was found necessary on a number of occasions to shorten and straighten the line. This meant two things: (1) advance at certain points beyond the line held; (2) the abandonment of old entrenchments. If the Christian position is to be tenable to-day, the old traditional line must be drastically and courageously shortened and straightened. It is almost impossible to get a hearing for this policy from our Traditionalist leaders and fellow soldiers. They regard the present entrenchments, some of them first-, some of them fourth-, and some of them sixteenth-century constructions, as absolutely adequate for to-day; they regard it as a sacred duty both to preserve and to defend them.

Walk about Zion: mark well her bulwarks that ye may tell them that come after.

Now the point which the Modernist would urge against the Traditionalist is that it is our Christian

duty not to defend the fortifications, but to defend the position. It is the position which is "the faith once for all delivered to the saints"; and the Christian faith is not to be identified with any ecclesiastical formulary, which is merely a fortification. The Christian faith is the faith which we have in Jesus Christ as the supreme unveiling in human history of the invisible God who is perfect Love, Light, and Truth, combined with the faith that men are themselves sharers in that Divine Nature. That is the *position* which we have to hold. Every Modernist whom I know holds it. That position is essentially Christian, and it is essentially Catholic. Some years ago I ventured to express it in words derived from that first-century writer known as St. John, the greatest of our New Testament Modernists, who transformed the Jewish Messiahism of the primitive Church into Hellenic Christian Universalism. This Modernist Creed ran as follows:

We believe that God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

We believe that God is Light, and that if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

We believe that God is Love, and that everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We believe that we are children of God, and that He hath given us of His Spirit.

We believe that, if we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

We believe that the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but that he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.

Those acquainted with either Catholic or Protestant dogmatic systems, or with the controversies which divide present-day Traditionalists from present-day Modernists, will discover that all the controversial issues are absent in this creed; they may even say that they have been "deftly avoided." Romanists, Anglicans, Unitarians, and Quakers could all unite in repeating it as they could unite in repeating the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes.

Traditionalist critics will point out that the Virgin Birth of Jesus, which the Modernist regards as *unhistorical*, is not even mentioned in this creed — and the same may be said of the Resurrection of Jesus. It, too, is absent. Whether the physical body of Jesus after His crucifixion was resuscitated, as some hold, or transmuted into a spiritual body, as others hold, or "saw corruption," as others hold, is not even touched on. It suffices for our faith that He is alive forevermore.

The same may be said of the Descent into Hades and the Ascension to, and Session at, the right hand of God. We know the part which the Harrowing of Hell and the physical Ascension played in mediæval theology. They have no place in this Modernist Confession of Faith. Neither is there any reference to the resurrection of the flesh, or to the return of Jesus to judge the quick and the dead, as in the ancient Creeds. Neither is there in it any reference to the one Catholic and Apostolic Church;

but there is a reference to that which is the very essence of it — the fellowship of those who are walking in the light. There is no reference in it to many things which the Protestant Confessions of Faith contain. For instance, there is no reference to Holy Scripture and its infallibility and authority; there is no reference to predestination and election; no reference to justification by Faith; nor to the doctrine of the Atonement; nor to the precise nature and number of the sacraments; nor to the right of national churches to govern themselves without outside interference from the Pope or anyone else. All these issues are dealt with in our English XXXIX Articles and other Protestant Confessions. I admit the charge. The line has been shortened and straightened, but the position is intact. This Johannine creed does not waste strength and energy in defending untenable or unnecessary salients. The old trenches were quite untenable at many points. This was not evident simply to men of military genius and to great students of military history — it was even more evident to practical soldiers, who tried to hold them. Christian teachers possessed of varied and mournful experience, like the Anglican army chaplains in the late War,¹ became convinced of the impossible and useless character of large parts of our traditional Church Theology. Mr.

¹ *Thoughts on Religion at the Front*, by Neville Talbot, A.C.G. (Macmillans.)

The Church in the Furnace by 17 chaplains, edited by F. B. Macnutt. (Macmillans.)

A Student in Arms, by Donald Hankey (1915).

Papers from Picardy, by T. W. Pym (1917).

Studdert Kennedy uttered the inmost convictions of many when he said:

It is awful to realize that when one stands up to preach Christ, the soldier feels that you are defending a whole ruck of obsolete theories and antiquated muddles.

It was a distinguished scientist who wrote recently:

The churches cannot afford to be hampered by unintelligible beliefs which are mainly materialistic accretions of Christianity, and which greatly weaken its influence on those who are worth influencing. Religion stands on ground which cannot be assailed: it has no need for rickety defences.¹

Those who have some claims to be students of theology and ecclesiastical history see these obsolete theories and antiquated muddles only too clearly to-day, and the man in the street sees some of them also. This causes the man in the street to conclude that the Christian position is untenable. He is wrong there: it is not the Christian position that is untenable, but many of the old Traditionalist trenches dug to defend it.

Modernists desire doctrinal reforms, but they desire that these reforms shall be granted freely by Traditionalist fellow Churchmen in response to a rising standard of education in the Church and a growing spirit of comprehensiveness, and not extorted by intellectual intimidation.

Now, in the judgment of the Modernist, these are some of the Traditionalist trenches which demand attention.

¹ *Modern Churchman* Conference Number (1924) p. 281.

1. First, there is the doctrine of God. How tremendous the reality! How tiny the word which expresses it! Which of us, asks Pascal, believes in that little word, "God"? We, as Modernists, believe in God, but our conception of Him differs from that which our fathers held. Their conception of Him was really that of an Oriental despot who, from a throne in the heavens, governed the Universe in accordance with certain inflexible principles derived from Semitic tradition, Hellenistic speculation, and Roman law — principles which seem to us to-day to be grotesque.

An earnest American layman addressing recently a group of American Modernists said: "You are the men who would modernize God." I do not know what they said in reply, but I should have said: "It is not God we desire to modernize, but the idea of God and His method of government which exists in the popular mind and is taught in the traditional theology." He who sits on the throne and declares His policy — "Behold, I am making all things new" — cannot be modernized. He is the Modernizer, the Modernist: He is the God of emergent evolution, Who is ever bringing new things to pass. But there exist too often in men's minds conceptions of Him and of His Will which belong to the early stages of religious evolution, ideas of His methods which are based on antiquated theories of Nature, false views of history, and ethical ideals which have been transcended. These the Modernist desires to modernize; if he cannot do that, his apologetic fails.

Those lines penned by Wordsworth in the hills

above Tintern in 1798 have become prophetic of the conception of God which was to come in with the nineteenth century.

I have felt

A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts: a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man,
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.

For centuries the Englishman's conception of God, like the Jew's and the Mohammedan's, has been that of a Transcendent Being. To-day the thought of the Divine Immanence is being combined with that of the Divine Transcendence. This has come about as the result of the influence of the Hegelian philosophy, the acceptance of evolution, and a growing acquaintance with religious mysticism — both Western and Eastern. The danger now is lest belief in Divine Immanence should drive out the belief in Divine Transcendence. I see no evidence of this in English Modernist teaching, though it is in evidence elsewhere. Although the Modernist believes in God as working in and through the creative process, he also believes in Him as existing both before, and independently of, the created universe. God is in all things, but not equally, and all things, but not equally, are in God.

*Intra cuncta nec inclusus,
Extra cuncta nec exclusus.*

The English Modernist stands here with James Ward, not with Baruch de Spinoza. An intellectual reconciliation of these two conceptions of the Divine mode of existence may be impossible, but the loss of spiritual and moral values which ensues if they are not both retained renders that retention needful. The result of this belief in the Divine Immanence has rendered the old anthropomorphic conception of God impossible. We cannot believe Him to be less than personal, but His personality must be something not different in kind but almost infinitely different in degree from human personality, for all personalities must in varying degrees exist in Him, and He in them. He is the source of their existence, and their vital energy is dependent on Him.

I am, O Lord, of Thee,
Not Thou, O Lord, of me,
For of the Sea is verily the wave,
Not of the wave the Sea.

Some English Modernists, like Dean Rashdall, have reasoned that the entering of God into creation involves the voluntary self-limitation of God, and that in the frank recognition of such self-limitation "lies the only solution of the problem of evil which does not either destroy the goodness of God or destroy moral distinctions altogether." There is in English Modernist circles a hesitancy about predicating of the Divine Nature absolutely those attributes of Omnipotence, Omniscience, Omnipresence, Immutability, Impassibility, Infinity, in which the Traditionalist theologians delighted. As Canon Simpson of St. Paul's remarks, "There is no

objection to such language, provided we clearly recognize that we mean no more than transcendent." Or, as the Reverend J. S. Bezzant has expressed it: "They either tell us nothing at all, or else if, by *misinterpretation*, they are made to mean something, they are either included in our highest values or are inconsistent with them." The Modernist tendency is to stress instead such attributes of God as Love, Light, Life, Truth, Joy, Beauty, Wisdom, Righteousness. To think of God as the *summum bonum* of humanity's deepest and noblest cravings:

O Domine fecisti nos ad Te, et cor nostrum est inquietum donec requiescat in Te.

And though all this be felt perhaps rather than thought, yet is the Modernist aware that he sees but through a glass darkly that Being of Beings in Whom all live and move and have their being.

Although the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity is liable to be perverted into Tritheism, owing to the ambiguous and indefinable term "Person" which is used in its formulation, yet the Trinitarian doctrine of God seems to the Modernist to be preferable to the old Unitarian doctrine. I say "the *old* Unitarian doctrine" advisedly, for it seems to me that the newer Unitarian and the newer Trinitarian may well reach a higher synthesis. The Trinitarian thought of God as Transcendent, Incarnate, Immanent, of God in Creation, in Christ, and in Conscience, preserves more values in its doctrine of God than did the older Unitarian Theology. While, on the one

hand, the doctrine of the Trinity teaches us to worship God as preëminently the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, yet, on the other hand, by presenting a picture of Divine Being which infinitely transcends human personality, it teaches us, as one has said, "faithfully and patiently to cultivate the dawning 'Copernican consciousness,'" and so guards us against anthropomorphism in our conception of the Divine Nature. The words of the judicious Hooker deserve attention in this connection.

Dangerous it were for the feeble brain of man to wade far into the doings of the Most High: whom although to know be life, and joy to make mention of his name: yet our soundest knowledge is, to know that we know him not as indeed he is, neither can know him: and our safest eloquence concerning him, is our silence, when we confess without confession, that his glory is inexplicable, his greatness above our capacity and reach. He is above, and we upon earth: therefore it behoveth our words to be wary and few.¹

2. Secondly, there is the doctrine of everlasting punishment. We no longer believe in it. It conflicts with our belief in the Fatherly love of God: divine discipline we believe in, both here and hereafter, but not in everlasting punishment: it is grotesque, absurd, incredible. Of course it is, assents my Traditionalist fellow Churchman. We none of us believe in it. It is true that, on the motion of Bishop Blomfield, F. D. Maurice was deprived of his professorship in King's College, London, in 1853, because he denied it; but that is one of those "old, unhappy,

¹ *Eccl. Pol.*, i, 2.

far-off things" which we have done with. Quite so, replies the Modernist, Why then retain it in the formularies? You recite your belief in it in the *Quicumque Vult*, and you retain this document as part of your Church Service. (In the United States it has been removed, but the doctrine of everlasting punishment is reflected still in hymns and litany and the burial service.) Why not shorten the line and get rid of this vulnerable salient? If our authorities still procrastinate, it is because they are more afraid of their Traditionalist brethren than they are of false teaching. But either we Modernists must have new formularies or else the old ones must be purged. A reformed theology demands revised formularies. Béranger is credited with saying: "Let me make the people's songs, I care not who makes their laws." So our Traditionalist brethren say to themselves: "Let the Modernists talk: they can have little real influence whilst the formularies, the creeds, the liturgies, and the hymns of the Church remain unaltered." That is the truth.

3. Thirdly, there is the doctrine of the propitiatory sacrifice of Jesus Christ: that Jesus died to *satisfy* the righteous wrath of God against sinful man, and so to deliver man from the Divine condemnation. I doubt if any educated or even uneducated English Churchman really believes in this *satisfaction*, or that Jesus died, as Article II of our XXXIX Articles affirms, "To reconcile His father to us and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for all actual sins of men." We all know that it is not God who requires to be changed, that

He may be reconciled to us, but it is humanity that requires to be changed that it may be reconciled to Him. We all know that Jesus gave His life as a ransom to redeem men from slavery to evil and to bring in the Kingdom of God: He did not offer Himself as a propitiatory sacrifice to an angry God. "The father" in the parable demands no propitiatory sacrifice in order to be reconciled to the prodigal. When the repentant prodigal comes to himself and leaves his husks and swine, the father sees him afar off and goes to meet him. The teaching of Jesus in this matter is that of the great prophets of Israel: "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." (*Ezekiel*, XVIII, 27.) Yet this teaching of Jesus has been blurred by Jewish priestly views of sacrifice, distorted by Rabbinical forensic dialectic, dehumanized by Scholastic logic, misrepresented by pagan conceptions of God, and the Traditionalist persists in retaining this blurred and distorted presentation. He refuses to listen to the petition of the Modernists to alter those terrible words in the Consecration Prayer in the Communion Office: "Who made there by his one oblation of himself once offered a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and *satisfaction*,¹ for the sins of the whole world." The Traditionalist refuses also to alter the phrases

¹ Sacrifice and oblation can claim Scriptural authority, but *satisfaction* cannot. It was used first in this connection in the eleventh century, and was popularized by St. Anselm's teaching. The attempt to give it the meaning of guaranty or pledge here fails, for that is not the meaning which it has in Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*?

with which a number of our prayers conclude, "for Jesus Christ's sake," "through the merits of Jesus Christ." The right and ancient formula is *per Christum*, not *pro Christo*. Our prayers are offered "through Christ," that is, in Christ's Name, in the light of His unveiling of the Divine Father Who wills to receive our prayers. We do not ask that God will accept our prayers because of the sacrificial death of Jesus; such a doctrine is sheer paganism, as dishonouring to God as it is to the moral law.

Of course English Modernists neither deny nor belittle the vicarious suffering of Jesus or its incalculable value for human moral and spiritual progress. The Cross rightly stands as the symbol of the Christian religion — a religion which demands willing obedience to the will of God, however hard and mysterious that will may be. The Christian religion faces, in the martyr-spirit of Jesus, the mysteries of suffering and death and consecrates them. Donald Hankey, an English Modernist, in *A Student in Arms*, wrote some very wonderful things of suffering and of Christ's relation to it. Canon J. M. Wilson's Hulsean Lectures, Dr. Douglas White's *Sin and Forgiveness*, Dean Rashdall's Bampton Lectures on the Atonement, purge and moralize the Atonement, presenting it in a form which the modern mind can receive. May I venture to say in this connection that it seems to me that in the future the Christian Church may find a growing need to point to the Cross of Jesus not so much as the means whereby, as in Bunyan's Allegory, the individual Christian is released from his burden of sin, but as a dreadful

warning of the way in which bureaucratic interests and official timidities combine with the passions and prejudices of the proletariat to crucify the saviours of humanity.

Meanwhile the line needs shortening and straightening here, and all those complicated slaughter-houses of trenches, whether constructed by St. Gregory of Nyssa, or St. Anselm, or St. Thomas Aquinas, or John Calvin, should be definitely abandoned — nay, filled in, to prevent the misguided from taking refuge in such death-traps.

4. Citing passages from our English formularies about the Atonement has led me to cite passages which refer to what is often spoken of as original sin. Sin by the Traditionalists is divided into two classes, "original" and "actual." Article II asserts that Christ died on account of "original guilt." This "guilt" was brought on the human race by the original sin of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden. Traditionalism teaches that Christ took that guilt on Himself when He died on the Cross, and so God was enabled to forgive it to mankind. Had Christ not taken it on Himself all mankind would have been lost everlastingly. Now, English Traditionalists no longer regard the Garden of Eden narrative as history, yet they retain the belief in Original Sin. They do this, if they are modern-minded, by interpreting the Garden of Eden story allegorically. There is no harm in that and I do it myself. Then they explain that original sin did not come from eating the apple in Eden, but is the product of our brute ancestry, and its survival in the human species.

Again, as a Modernist I can have no objection to the domesticating of this article of Darwinian science in the theology of the Christian Church, but as a Modernist I object to Traditionalists' regarding this new conception of original sin as entailing original guilt. You and I may possess a brute ancestry and brute instincts, but we are not to blame for this; if anyone is to blame, it is God. An epigrammatist may go so far as to speak of a man as being unfortunate in the choice of his parents. I have never known the most daring epigrammatist to pronounce him as criminal in his choice of his parents, yet Traditionalists cling to this doctrine of original guilt, and baptize infants for the purpose among others of cleansing them from this original guilt. At the baptismal service of every infant the baptizing clergymen in the English Church begins by declaring, "Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin"; he then proceeds to pray that "this infant may receive remission of his sins," and later on consecrates "water to the mystical washing away of sin." To have to teach children, as the Catechism requires, that they are "born in sin and the children of wrath" seems to the Modernist to be monstrous; to have to tell parents that the child they bring to the font has been "conceived and born in sin" is to suggest, so the Modernist urges, those horrible views of sex which we unfortunately owe mainly to St. Augustine, and which have been responsible for much unwholesome and untrue teaching which has presented as shameful what should be viewed as sacred.

There is no original guilt adhering to infants, and

even if there were, to regard the water of baptism as washing it away is a magical view of that sacrament. It is full time, so the Modernist urges, that the line here were shortened and straightened. Let it suffice that children are baptized because they are the potential children of God, and because baptism admits them into the Christian Church, the human family of God, where they can be trained as His children. That was the teaching of Robertson of Brighton. That trench is very short, but it is tenable; the other is not tenable to-day.

5. Again, there is all that intricate salient of traditional trenches connected with eschatology. There is the coming of Jesus on the clouds of heaven; there is the rising of the dead at the blast of the archangel's trumpet; there is the great assize of judgment; there is the assignment of all humanity to its final lot in heaven or hell.

Too bad for heaven, too good for hell,
Where has he gone? We cannot tell.

This trench needs shortening and straightening. The language and ideas are those of Jewish apocalyptic, but it will be urged that St. Paul used them and took them literally. He seems to have done so; he certainly believed that our first parents' sin brought physical death into the world. Geology proves that physical death was reigning on this earth millions of years before man appeared. St. Paul was not infallible in that view, neither was he infallible in his eschatology. He expected the visible return of Jesus in the clouds within a few years'

time. He was mistaken there. What do we look for in the future? A return of Jesus in visible form? No. We look for two things. The coming of the Kingdom of God on earth, even as Jesus taught His disciples to pray, "Thy Kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven." We look also for the life of the world to come, but we shall pass to it, not through our coffin lids, but, as William Blake depicts that passage, from our dying bodies. As for Divine Judgment, it is taking place always in human society and in ourselves. Every crisis in Church and State may be viewed as a Divine *dies irae*.

No action whether foul or fair
Is ever done, but it leaves somewhere
A record, written by fingers ghostly,
As a blessing or a curse, and mostly
In the greater weakness, or greater strength
Of the acts which follow it, till at length
The wrongs of ages are redressed
And the justice of God made manifest.¹

Every personal decision on moral issues and the consequences which ensue is to "stand before the Judgment-seat of Christ to receive the things done in the body"; but to modern ears it is best expressed, not in the language of Jewish eschatology, but in that of our modern psychologists, as, for instance, by William James in such a passage as the following:

The hell to be endured hereafter of which theology talks, is no worse than the hell we make for ourselves in this world by habitually fashioning our characters in the

¹ Longfellow, *The Golden Legend*.

wrong way. Could the young but realize how soon they will become mere walking bundles of habits, they would give more heed to their conduct while in the plastic state. We are spinning our own fates, good or evil, and never to be undone. Every smallest stroke of virtue or of vice leaves its never so little scar. The drunken Rip Van Winkle, in Jefferson's play, excuses himself for every fresh dereliction by saying, "I won't count this time." Well, he may not count it, and a kind Heaven may not count it; but it is being counted none the less. Down among his nerve-cells and fibres the molecules are counting it, registering and storing it up to be used against him when the next temptation comes. Nothing we ever do is, in strict scientific literalness, wiped out.¹

And that judgment determines the nature of our future life, and indeed, for all we know, whether it will be possible for us to have any future life at all. Bishop Butler in the eighteenth century taught that God governs this world by laws which execute themselves by way of reward or punishment on those who obey or disobey them. This is a Divine Judgment in which the modern man, if he be not a fool, must believe, and in which he does well to believe — and it is essentially Christian. It is the New Testament which declares:

Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap; he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit, shall of the Spirit reap life eternal.

¹ W. James, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology: and to Students on some of Life's Ideals*.

It is a modern preacher who has said:

Sow a thought and you reap an act; sow an act and you reap a habit; sow a habit and you reap a character; sow a character and you reap a destiny.

If any man suffers eternal death, it is not God who damns him: the man himself commits suicide.

The Modernist is as convinced as the Traditionalist that the later scenes of humanity's drama are not staged on this planet or amid the things of sense and time. The scientific view of the future state of this earth is that of Prospero in *The Tempest*:

The cloud-capp'd towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind.

If the creative process on this planet is making a permanent contribution to reality, then that contribution is plainly not material, but spiritual, and can only take the form of human personalities capable of surviving into another sphere. If the creative process is not producing anything permanent, it cannot be regarded as either rational or moral. It would be generally agreed by Modernists that there is to-day less interest in the question of immortality than there used to be, and that modern men claim to believe in God and enjoy communion with Him without having any conviction that they will survive death. Nevertheless, the conviction that no human being can or will survive death must deprive

the creative process on this earth of significance and value. Hence the English Modernist, as a believer in immortality, stands with Kant and not with Spinoza. But though a future life is not incredible, yet its conditions are unimaginable. Hence the descriptions of that life beyond the tomb which are based by Traditional Theology on the eschatological visions of the Apocalyptic Seer and the great poem of Bernard of Morlaix, have less power to inspire and uplift the Modernist than the lyric notes of our own English poets, such as Wordsworth's "Ode to Immortality," Tennyson's "In Memoriam" and "Crossing the Bar," Browning's "Epilogue to Asolando," Mrs. Barbauld's "Life we've been long together," Vaughan's "My soul there is a country, Afar beyond the stars," Richard Baxter's "Christ leads me through no darker rooms."

Yet while the Modernist believes in a future life, he is opposed, in the interests of the higher morality, to stressing its rewards and penalties as the motive for right conduct in this life. The "other worldliness" of Traditionalism jars. St. François Xavier's hymn: "My God, I love Thee, not because I hope for heaven thereby," breathes the atmosphere of a nobler motive.

6. Again, there are those trenches connected with the Bible, its nature and authority. We do well to look at the plan of them as drawn even within our own life-time by Dean Burgon, the great opponent of Westcott and Hort, if only to realize what a portentous amount of time, energy, and ingenuity has been spent in their defence.

The Bible is none other than the voice of Him that "sitteth upon the Throne." Every book of it, every chapter of it, every verse of it, every word of it, every syllable of it, every letter of it, is the direct utterance of the Most High. The Bible is none other than the Word of God, not some part of it more and some part of it less, but all alike the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne, faultless, unerring, supreme.

Those who dared to oppose this view were satirized by the eloquent and witty Dean Mansel in his too little known *Phrontisterion*, in the following lines:

Ye presbyters bend, ye bishops attend,
The Bible's a myth from beginning to end,
With a bug, bug, bug, and a hum, hum, hum,
Hither the new theologians come.

Assertions of Biblical infallibility and finality, after a hard struggle, are being abandoned by educated English Christians, and belief in an infallible Bible is being replaced by belief in an inspired Bible. The statement that the Bible is the Word of God is being replaced by the statement that it contains the Word of God, not the only one, but the clearest and most authoritative for practical purposes. Modernists recognize that the Bible relates the history of the religious and moral evolution of Israel which culminated in the Gospel of Jesus and the foundation of the Christian Church. The Bible is necessary to the historical understanding of the origin and development of our own religion; it not only furnishes its student with magnificent narra-

atives of prophetic preaching, devotional aspiration, noble and heroic examples of loyalty to truth and righteousness: it provides him in addition with a key to the higher interpretation of the Universe — its moral and spiritual interpretation; that key unlocks the door through which we see God as the source, director, and consummator of the whole creative process, and when once we have seen God in the Bible we can then see Him operating in nature, in human history, and in the human soul. The Bible teaches how we may enter into communion with Him and both learn His will and do it; and he who does that will find himself echoing the verdict of Amiel, the Genevan professor:

Destiny has two ways of crushing us — by refusing our desires and by fulfilling them. But he who only wills what God wills escapes both catastrophes.

But, for the rest, the Modernist urges the Traditionalist to accept the assured results of criticism as to the origin, dates, composition, integrity, historicity, and scientific value of the various books. The test of the moral and spiritual value of the Bible is the test of experience — the test which S. T. Coleridge was one of the first of Englishmen to put forward as the proof of its inspiration:

“Whatever *finds* me bears witness for itself that it has proceeded from a Holy Spirit.”¹

That is a short and defensible trench in comparison with Biblical infallibility.

¹ *Confessions*, Letter I.

7. Closely connected with the doctrine of the Bible is that of Revelation. The traditional view of Revelation presented the knowledge of God, as a unique system of truth miraculously communicated from heaven to earth. The Modernist urges rather that Revelation is implied in the very structure of the human mind, so that the processes of thought, conscience, affection, truly understood, involve the recognition of the Infinite and Eternal. It is because we are what we are, and are becoming what we are becoming, that God can and does unveil Himself to us, that is, *in us*. Hence the Modernist teaches that the Divine method of Revelation is internal — God speaking, not as Traditionalism teaches, in tones of thunder from the sky, but with a still small voice in the human consciousness.

The late Auguste Sabatier put the Modernist view very clearly:

If revealers and prophets believed they heard the voice of God outside themselves, they were the victims of psychological illusion that analysis discerns and dissipates. The old theologian was right who said, "There is no faith save in the heart where God has first made Himself heard; and there are no divine words except those which faith hears in the inmost sanctuary of the soul."¹

Hence Revelation and Religious Evolution are really the same thing viewed from opposite sides — inside and outside. In Divine Revelation God is

¹ *Philosophy of Religion*, English Translation, pp. 54, 55. "*Nulla fides si non primum Deus ipse loquitur; Nullaque verba Dei nisi quae in penetralibus audit ipsa fides.*"

contemplated as communicating Himself to the soul which is waiting upon Him. "Speak, Lord, for Thy servant heareth." In Religious Evolution the scientist investigates the universal manifestation and development of religion in human history. It is Divine Inspiration which provides the impulse of this Religious Evolution through its various stages. That which comes from God unveils God to man, and uplifts man to God.

Another point in which the Modernist differs from the Traditionalist about Revelation is in holding that Revelation is a present reality.

In holy books we read how God hath spoken
To holy men, in many different ways;
But hath the present world no sign or token?
Is God quite silent in these latter days?

Revelation did not stop with the conclusion of the New Testament. It has, in accordance with Christ's promise of the gift of the Spirit, been continuously operating ever since. The Modernist believes that this revelation is made "in Christ"; that is to say, it will always be found to be in harmony with those moral and spiritual ideals which He taught: it unveils their implications and applications to our expanding experience. Hence there is a special Revelation of God to each age which can be neglected only with loss and peril. For instance, the Revelation contained in the Bible is not adequate of itself for this age. As Dean Rashdall said in the concluding words of his last published sermon: ¹

¹ *Jesus: Human and Divine*; preached on Oct. 9, 1921.

Let us try to take seriously the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is teaching something — something important and something new — to the Church of our own generation; and let us — each in proportion to his leisure, his vocation, and his opportunities — try to discover what it is, and to do what we can to communicate to others whatever measure of truth God has revealed to us and to the Church of our day. Now, as in former times, the Holy Spirit of God is saying to us: “He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.”

There is not time to deal here with many other doctrines in which the Modernist presentation differs from the Traditionalist. The Modernist wishes the Church to adopt them in the Modernist form for two reasons: first, they are more true in that form than in the Traditionalist form, and secondly, they are able in the Modernist form to win the adhesion of the modern man: and the Modernist is convinced not only that the Church must have a true theology, but also that the individual must have a true theology too. It matters not how simple his theology is. What does matter is that it should be in accordance with the truth as he knows it. His reason and conscience, the sense of truth, and the sense of right, guard the entry to the heart of the modern man; and though Christianity would fain enter his heart, yet unless her creed can make terms with his reason and his conscience, she must remain outside.

Some will, no doubt, regard this outline of Modernist reconstruction as extremely dull and disappointing. It will seem to be lacking both in original-

ity and in courage. The English Modernist is not surprised, nor is he perturbed, by these charges. He can make no claim to originality or heroism. He is only concerned, in the face of mental inertia and obscurantist mediævalizing to urge that serious consideration must be given to truth which is being won by modern research and growing experience. The truth is not his, but God's, and he knows that the Church can reject or neglect it only with grievous loss. He is well aware that English and American Unitarians and German Liberal Protestants, and indeed many others, have rejected more of the traditional dogmas than has the English Modernist. In some ways it is natural that they should. He is conscious of the need of striving to preserve values such as the continuity of Christian thought and the unity of Church life, to which the former seem to be largely indifferent. The extreme positions adopted by M. Loisy and other leaders of Romanist Modernism have served as a useful warning to the English Modernist. Hence the English Modernist is not ashamed to be called mediating and cautious. He knows that he is both. It would be easier for him not to be so. The separation of error from truth in the Christian religion is a delicate and difficult undertaking. As Renan, who at any rate was no coward, pointed out, truth dwells in *les nuances*, or, as the equally dogma-liberated Omar Khayyam has expressed it:

A hair, perhaps, divides the False and True
Yes! and a single Alif were the clue,
Could you but find it, to the Treasure House
And peradventure, to the Master, too.

As Modernists, we are willing to follow whithersoever Reason leads, provided Reason be understood to include not merely intellectual conclusions, but also moral and spiritual judgments; but as Englishmen, we are not willing to part with any of the values which have been entrusted to us. Because we are not fanatics we know that to achieve enduring success demands not only much patient effort, but also much wisdom. There are many factors to be dealt with in such a campaign. Just as the failure of Continental Modernism is not without its lessons for us, so equally are the victories and defeats of the Protestant Reformation. As English Modernists, we stand for the authority in our Church life of Truth and Freedom, Progress and Tolerance, Comprehensiveness and Continuity: we also maintain that in our Church teaching Religion must be distinguished from Theology, Spirit distinguished from Letter, Ends distinguished from Means, Fact distinguished from Mode, Essential distinguished from Non-essential, the Content of Revelation from its Form, but we do not claim that we see clearly in every case what is the decision to which these distinctions must lead. We recognize, on the one hand, the evils of Traditionalism, but we also recognize the dangers which arise from hasty decisions and wholesale destruction and rejection. There is a ruthless way of restoring ancient Church buildings which is known in England as "grimthorping" them; the Modernist has no desire to "grimthorpe" either the Church or its Theology. The temptation is to begin with the outside — every fool bent on re-

form succumbs to it; this method promises immediate and visible results. The Modernist is sure that in our work of reconstruction we must begin with the inside, the spirit and thought of the Church, and that this will gradually influence externals, and modify them in the right way. In other words, the Modernist favours educational methods pre-eminently. This means that progress will be slow, but it will also be sure. The proverb: "He that goes slowly goes surely, and he that goes surely goes far," is a side of the truth which zealous and courageous men — not time-servers and cowards — should grapple to their breasts with hoops of steel.

X

MODERNISM AND MIRACLES

An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given it, — *Jesus Christ*.

The concept of miracle is dangerous from the religious as well as from the scientific standpoint. It is a bastard which neither parent can afford to own. — HARALD HÖFFDING.

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy. — SHAKESPEARE.

THE unpardonable heresy in orthodox circles in England to-day is not to believe in miracles. It is charged against the Modernist that he does not believe in miracles. This seems to mean to the Traditionalists who make the charge that since the Modernist does not believe in miracles, therefore he cannot believe in the authority of Holy Scripture, in a Divine Revelation, in the Incarnation, in God's government of the world, and in many other Christian convictions. As a consequence, the Traditionalists, who to-day are contending tooth and nail for miracles, just as their predecessors a few years ago contended with equal zeal and fury for the plenary inspiration and verbal inerrancy of Scripture, are in their own minds contending for much more than miracles. Miracles are merely the spear-head to a whole position. If there be surrender at that point to the Modernist Arnold von Winkelried,

all is lost. Let the Romanist but surrender the absolute authority of the Pope; the Catholic surrender the infallibility of the Church; the Traditionalist Protestant surrender the inerrancy of Holy Scripture; the Traditionalist Anglican surrender the miraculous, then all he is contending for is lost. So desperate is his defence that in the last resort the Traditionalist is willing to surrender the thing, if only he may keep the name.

I propose to deal with this subject under eight heads.

1. The Modernist, in directing the attention of the Church authorities to the question of the miraculous, is not dealing with a purely speculative or academic question but with a very practical one. It is an issue — and let it be remembered that the Modernist is not responsible for its origin — which concerns the influence of Christianity in this modern world. Dr. Bethune-Baker, a leading English Modernist, who is Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, brought this out clearly in his Open Letter addressed to Bishop Gore during the Kikuyu Controversy in 1914, entitled, *The Miracle of Christianity*. He wrote to the Bishop:

By far the greater danger that threatens the Church at the present time in this respect seems to me to be failure to recognise fully enough the new conditions of intellectual background and outlook under which our younger men are growing up, and the consequent risk of alienation from the Church of men and women who feel that they cannot honestly serve as ministers or even worship as members of that Church, because it appears

to have bound up its Faith and its Life inextricably with "proofs" that are no proofs to them, and to declare that belief in the Miracle of Christianity — the Miracle of the Christian Life — depends upon belief in "miracles" for which no evidence that is really convincing to them is forthcoming (pp. 15, 16).

2. The Modernist is able to retain his Christian Faith without a belief in miracles. He believes in the authority of Holy Scripture, the reality of Divine Revelation, the fact of the Incarnation, the Divine government of the World, but without believing in miracles. It is very hard for the Traditionalist to realize this. //

When Mr. N. P. Williams, the possessor of one of the keenest intellects on the Traditionalist side, declares that if a papyrus were discovered disproving the Virgin Birth, he would "without hesitation abandon . . . the whole of Christianity as well,"¹ the Modernist who is not acquainted with the Catholic reasons for belief in the Virgin Birth will find it hard to understand him. To the Modernist mind the miracles attached to doctrines seem to create a difficulty in accepting them, not to constitute a reason for accepting them. The modernist distinction between the *fact* and the *mode* is what alone in such cases enables the Modernist to hold the doctrine while he detaches and rejects the miracles which adhere to it. He regards them as having been created by belief in the doctrine and the desire to prove and protect it, rather than as being the original source of the doctrine itself. If we glance

¹ *Form and Content in the Christian Tradition*, p. 90.

for a moment at the miracle which Mr. N. P. Williams makes the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*, we can see at least five reasons for a Traditionalist's believing in the Virgin Birth quite apart from any historical evidence for it.

(a) As a marvellous fulfilment of *Isaiah* VII, 14 (according to the Septuagint, not the original Hebrew text), it enabled the primitive Christian triumphantly to confute Jewish slanders against our Lord's legitimacy by an appeal to the Jewish Scriptures, and so to affirm His Divine Sonship. We see this clearly in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with one Trypho, a Jew*.

(b) As against Docetic Gnostics who denied the real humanity of Jesus, it enabled Christians like St. Ignatius to point to the child-bearing of Mary as proof that Jesus truly shared human flesh and blood.

(c) As against those who, like Helvidius, depreciated the monastic and celibate life, it was possible to point to *Maria semper virgo* and the chastity of St. Joseph as consecrating virginity.

(d) As against the Pelagians, believers like St. Augustine in Original Sin and its devastating results could point (albeit illogically) to the Virgin Birth as breaking the entail of Original Sin, and so preserving the sacrificial spotlessness of Jesus.

(e) As against the exclusively male conception of God, the Virgin Birth was enthusiastically maintained by those who hailed Mary as *Theotokos*, not with the purpose of preserving the divine honour of the Son, but with the purpose of conferring divine honour on the Mother.

If to surrender the Virgin Birth means to a Catholic to surrender the Sonship of Jesus to God, the perfect manhood of Jesus, the sanctity of the celibate life, the cleansing power of Baptism, the cultus of the Virgin, we can see why a Catholic can declare that to surrender the Virgin Birth is to surrender Christianity; but we must observe that the Traditionalists' refusal to surrender the Virgin Birth does not depend upon the historic evidence for it; and we must observe further that all those whose conception of the moral and spiritual supremacy of Jesus is not based upon His being Virgin-born can accept the conclusion of the critics that the Virgin Birth is a myth without being in the least affected in their hold on the Christian Faith.

3. The Modernist feels that in the Traditionalist discussion of miracles two things which should be kept strictly apart are hopelessly mixed up. These two things are *fact* and *interpretation*. Some of the alleged miracles are not facts; and some of the alleged facts are not miracles. Every discussion about miracle ought rightly to begin with settling the question of fact. Hence the investigation is one which resolves itself into a question of evidence. Is the evidence, according to modern historical standards, sufficiently strong to justify our considering such and such an alleged miracle to be a fact? If the answer be No, *cadit quæstio*. If it be Yes, then the question arises whether the fact should be interpreted as a miracle or not. Here we are faced with the difficulty of what is meant by a miracle. The old conception of a miracle was something that was

contrary to Nature (*contra naturam*). This has been abandoned in the modern world, as it sounds to scientific ears either blasphemy or bosh. Nothing in Nature can be contrary to Nature. To-day the Traditionalist conception of miracle is that it is above Nature (*supra naturam*) — a Divine interposition in the natural sphere. This "irruptionist" conception of miracle is beset with difficulties on two sides. On the one hand it suggests the question that if God can act thus irruptively to deliver — shall we say? — St. Peter from prison, why should He not intervene irruptively to deliver the world from the horrors of the late war? On the other hand, is it not more likely that, if the event in question be a fact, then it is not really irruptionist, but comes under a law of Nature of which we are as yet ignorant, or which, if we know it, we have not thought of using to explain the Divine *modus operandi* in this connection? Our modern scientific experience certainly suggests the latter as the more probable explanation.

This view of miracles as natural phenomena goes back in the Christian Church at least as far as St. Augustine. He defined miracles as "portents which are not contrary to Nature, but are contrary to what we know of Nature" (*portenta . . . non contra naturam, sed contra quam est nota natura*).¹

4. The Modernist does not maintain, as he is often accused of doing, that miracles are *impossible*. He modestly feels that he knows too little of the Universe to affirm this. The Modernist's method is

¹ *De Civitate Dei*, XXI, 8.

not that of an *a priori* metaphysician: his approach to such questions is historical and scientific. Dr. Tennant of Trinity College, Cambridge, in a book entitled *Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions*, published this year, has maintained with considerable dialectical skill that of "laws which never shall be broken, we know nothing." The comment made by Mr. Bezzant, one of our younger English Modernists, on this conclusion, runs as follows: "But of laws which never are broken we know a good deal." The situation would interest Bishop Joseph Butler, for whom probability was the very guide of life. Modern science postulates as its working hypothesis the uniformity of Nature, and this hypothesis, as Hume pointed out, raises a strong presumption against the accuracy of each record of any supposed miracle; at the same time the Modernist recognizes that this very probable hypothesis, since it is hypothesis and not demonstration, does not constitute conclusive evidence that the record is false.

It is maintained by Traditionalists that those who do not believe in miracles must hold a mechanistic theory of the universe. This is not necessary. It is possible to point to any number of well-known thinkers who have discarded miracles but whose view of the universe is not mechanistic. I will cite but one example, that of the well-known scientist J. S. Haldane, F.R.S. (who was sent by the British Government to examine the German poison gas in the late war and devise protection against it). Though Professor Haldane does not believe in the

occurrence of miracles, he 'says of the mechanistic view of the Universe: "We have parted once and for all with the mechanistic philosophy."¹

X 5. The Traditionalist has always maintained that miracles have an evidential value. This was the belief behind the Pharisees' request: "Show us a sign from heaven"; and it was the fundamental position of Paley's *Christian Evidences*. Let us add in all honesty that it is also the position of the Fourth Gospel and the Pseudo-Mark, with their miraculous signs. Indeed, it seems to have been the view of everyone in primitive Christianity except our Lord. How, it may be asked, are we to know that a Divine Revelation is true, if it be not attested by miracles? The Traditionalist reply was this: We cannot know, and so God has supplied His revelation in the Old and New Testament with appropriate miracle-proofs. The Modernist's reply, which goes back at least as far as S. T. Coleridge, is this: I know this is true because it *finds me*; in other words, the appeal which it makes to my moral and spiritual consciousness, and to the moral and spiritual consciousness of many others who are more moral and spiritual than I am, is the proof that this is a Divine Revelation — that is, an unveiling of moral and spiritual truth. It is generally agreed to-day that miracles can prove nothing beyond themselves, and that when Matthew Arnold wrote sarcastically, "to prove to you that what I am writing is true, I propose to turn my pen into a pen-wiper," he was not writing blasphem-

¹ *Mechanism, Life and Personality*, p. 81.

mous nonsense but justifiable criticism of a view of miracles which is now discredited.

6. It is however urged by Traditionalists that, although miracles do not prove the truth of moral and spiritual teaching, they can and do prove the holiness of the teacher. "No man can do these signs which Thou doest except God be with him," says Nicodemus, the Rabbi, to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel (III, 2). This is the belief of the Roman Church, and so it demands evidence that at least three miracles have been wrought by any one who is put forward for canonization. This belief is also prevalent in Buddhism. There is, however, no secure basis for it. John the Baptist wrought no miracle. It is the faith of the Saint's followers which enables the miracles to be wrought. "Thy faith hath saved thee," is the reply of Jesus to those who would attribute their healing to Him. Canon Glazebrook, in his *Faith of a Modern Churchman*, writes (pp. 67, 68):

In many ages of the world there has been a firm belief that "holy men" are sure to work miracles; and this belief has frequently caused natural events to be interpreted in a non-natural way.

When, therefore, we read narratives involving miracles, we are bound to ask how far these tendencies are likely to have been present in the narrator or his informants. Nor must we be misled by the plea that, when accounts of miracles are found in a writer who is otherwise trustworthy, they must be accepted or else he must be discredited. Such an argument ignores psychology. For in an age which regards miracle as part of

common experience, the most critical historians cannot resist the general tendency. Few early writers, for instance, are more sensible and reliable than the Venerable Bede. For much of the early history of England he is excellent authority. And yet his narrative is strewn with tales of wonder which we unhesitatingly reject as merely childish.

Belief in miracles is a survival from the pre-scientific way of viewing the Universe, and the desire for miracles creates belief not only in miracles, but in what seem, in that stage of knowledge, certainly to be miracles. It was his failure to recognize this which led that great teacher, George Salmon, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, to declare that a non-miraculous Christianity is as incredible as a quadrangular circle. At a later stage after a careful comparative study of the Synoptic Gospels he abandoned this view.¹

7. The attitude of Christ towards miracles favours the Modernist attitude towards them. This attitude of Christ has become clearer with the critical study of the Gospels, and with the relegation of the Fourth Gospel from the sphere of historical narrative to that of Christian apologetic, symbolism, allegory, and mystical contemplation. Although, as Professor Percy Gardner remarks, "Luke dearly loves a good miracle," Jesus, in the Synoptic Gospels, does not appear as a lover of the miraculous. He scorns the faith which demands miracles to support it; He refuses to work miracles in accordance with such de-

¹ See, *The Human Element in the Gospels*. (Editor's Preface, p. xi.)

mands; He points to the wisdom-loving Queen of Sheba, and the repentant Ninevites, who required no miracle to convince and convert them, as examples of a faith not to be found in His contemporaries. He declares that those who hear not Moses and the prophets will not be persuaded though one rose from the dead. As the Gospels are studied, a tendency to increase the miraculous element in the later narratives is observable, and this makes one rightly suspicious of the miraculous element altogether. For instance, the narrative of the Baptism of Jesus in Mark's Gospel is non-miraculous, but in the later Gospels of Luke, Matthew, and John it is essentially miraculous.¹ The modern critic regards some of the miracles in the Synoptic Gospels as mythical, for example, the restoring of the ear of the High Priest's servant severed by St. Peter; others, like the miracles of healing, he regards as facts but not as miracles, for he views psychotherapy as science not as thaumaturgy; other miracles he regards as accounts of facts, but is more than doubtful of their miraculous interpretation, for example, the stilling of the storm, the stater in the fish's mouth, the two great draughts of fishes. In any case he is convinced that, whether he believes or disbelieves them to be miracles, he is neither a better nor a worse Christian; and he is convinced that a faith in our Lord which is either based on or supported by His miracles is a faith which our Lord would not desire; and he is equally sure that the Christian

¹ See H. D. A. Major, *Jesus, by an Eye-Witness*, pp. 18 f.

Church has no moral and spiritual right to demand a belief in the miraculous from Christian teachers and believers to-day.

8. The Modernist asks: Why is it men believe in miracles? The answer is, partly because they delight in wonders, and partly because anything extraordinary in pre-scientific ages was bound to be interpreted as miraculous. But, it may be said, these reasons do not account for the Traditionalist retention of miracles to-day. That is so. The Traditionalist wishes to believe not only in God, but in God operating in human life past and present. He does not know how to believe in this, how to secure evidence of it, apart from or without miracles. Now this is, as Dean Inge has said, "looking for God through the chinks in His Universe." The Modernist urges that we must cultivate the thought of God as immanent, ever-present, operating through every creative process. We must perceive Him operating in Nature, as did William Wordsworth. We must perceive Him operating in human history, as did the Hebrew prophets. We must perceive Him operating in Jesus, as did the primitive Church. We must perceive Him operating in our own hearts, as did the Christian mystics. When we can do that, in some measure the desire for the miraculous, or at any rate the need for it, is discarded. Our attitude becomes that of the modern hymn writer:

We pray no more, made lowly-wise,
For miracle and sign;
Anoint our eyes to see within
The common, the Divine.

In view of these conclusions the English Modernist demands that disbelief in miracles shall not be regarded by Traditionalists as unorthodoxy. He cannot forget the penalties inflicted on the Reverend J. M. Thompson, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, a devout and able clergyman, because in the name of criticism he declared the miracles of the Virgin Birth of Christ and His physical Resurrection to be unhistorical. Nor can the Modernist recall without grief the number of excellent men who have been turned back from ordination because they could not believe the Virgin Birth.

Essential Christianity requires the Christian to believe in God as ever acting in the universe, — to believe in Him as the Living God, — and essential Christian faith should enable the Christian to behold the Divine Spirit operating at all times in Nature and in History and in the Soul of Man; whether miraculously or non-miraculously is a quite secondary matter. If a Christian have this essential faith, the Modernist protests against his being required to declare that he believes that God acts miraculously, especially when it is not clear what is meant exactly by that term, or to declare that he believes certain alleged facts to be miraculous, when it is not clear that the alleged facts are facts, or, even if they be facts, that they are miracles.

It need hardly be said here that the emergence of the rational, moral, and spiritual in the creative process bears impressive testimony to the Divine creative presence and operation, even as does the advent in human history of the personality and

abiding influence of Jesus Christ. It is the recognition of these supreme and authoritative aspects of the Divine in human life which constitutes essential Christian faith. Minor matters connected with them, Christians as Christians — not as scientists or historians or philosophers — ought not to dispute about.

XI

MODERNISM AND JESUS CHRIST

"We are far too apt to limit and mechanize the great doctrine of the Incarnation, which forms the centre of the Christian faith. Whatever else it may mean, it means at least this — that in the conditions of the highest human life we have access, as nowhere else, to the inmost nature of the Divine. 'God manifest in the flesh' is a more profound philosophical truth than the loftiest flight of speculation that outsoars all predicates and, for the greater glory of God, declares Him unknowable." — A. S. PRINGLE-PATTISON.¹

No Christian philosophy can have any value which does not bring the Incarnation into closest relation with the cosmic process. — W. R. INGE.²

C'est un des grands principes du Christianisme, que tout ce qui est arrivé à Jesus-Christ doit se passer dans l'âme et dans le corps de chaque Chrétien. — PASCAL.

We are to study the Divine in and through the human. By looking for the Divine side by side with the human, instead of discerning the Divine within the human, we miss the significance of them both. — R. C. MOBERLY.

The truth that God is incarnate in a humanity which itself in Him dies to sin and lives to God, which is the truth of the New Testament, is not yet that of the Church. — DU BOSE.³

I

In dealing with Modernist dogmatic reconstruction I deliberately held over the subject of Jesus Christ and Modernism for fuller treatment. Eng-

¹ *The Idea of God in Recent Philosophy*, p. 157.

² *Contentio Veritatis*, p. 74.

³ *The Oecumenical Councils*, p. 283.

lish Modernism is essentially Christo-centric. It accepts the Nicene homoöusion. The historic Jesus is for it the supreme unveiling in human history of the Divine Nature, subject to human limitations. The words of Robert Browning represent its conviction:

There may be other Words for other worlds,
But for this world the Word of God is Christ;

or, perhaps better still, the words of Mr. Edwyn Bevan: "The inner Reality of the universe has looked into human eyes through the eyes of Jesus Christ."

English Modernism may in consequence be charged with Jesuolatry because it adores the Godhead as unveiled in the personality, teaching, and spirit of Jesus. It may be contemptuously dismissed by its opponents as Jesuanity rather than as Christianity, as Canon Foakes Jackson dismissed it in the *Hibbert Journal* of January, 1922. It meets these charges with equanimity. It is convinced that it stands on firm ground historically when it refuses to separate the Jesus of history from the Christ of the Catholic Church.

For it, Christianity is the apotheosis of the personality of Him who was known as Jesus of Nazareth. He is the source and origin of the Christian Church. It is perfectly clear that the Church sprang from the disciples of Jesus; first His hearers; then His followers; then His pupils; then His worshippers; then His messengers, the bearers of His Gospel and the recipients of His Spirit. The author of the

Acts records that in the early days of the Christian Church the Jewish authorities "took knowledge" of the Church's leaders (Peter and John) "that they had been with Jesus."¹ It was their distinguishing characteristic. The New Testament closes with the ardent longing of the Church for His triumphant return: "Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus."

The critical tendency which in the name of History seeks to show that Christianity is an eclectic religion having its origin in various aspirations and tendencies, cults and philosophies, in the first century of our era, is one with which English Modernism feels itself out of sympathy, for such a theory fails to do justice to the personality of Jesus as constituting the magnetic centre which attracted all these things to itself. Geology acquaints us with formations known as concretions, the origin of which we may describe with seeming scientific omniscience as due to the action of concretionary forces. We really know little or nothing about the origin or action of such forces. What we do know when we break the concretion open is that in its very centre is a nucleus, it may be a fern-leaf, a shell, a pebble, a flint, to which particles have been attracted and round which in layer after layer they have been arranged. Without the nucleus we cannot account for the concretion. This in some ways is not a very happy metaphor. I should prefer, I think, that of a seed-bed. The historical critics whom I have in mind, describe with great erudition the nature of the seed-bed: its chemical constitu-

¹ *Acts*, iv. 13.

ents, its temperature, its aspect, its enclosing fence, the gardeners who cultivated it. This, they argue, accounts for what it has produced.

They omit, however, to attach any significance to the seed sown in the seed-bed. Yet what its nucleus is to the concretion, what the seed is to the product of the seed-bed, the personality of Jesus is to Christianity. The practical elimination of the personality of Jesus from Christianity, or the reduction of that personality to insignificant dimensions is unsound criticism. Glance for a moment at the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels. The threefold portrait they enshrine is essentially historical; it has gathered round it various legendary accretions, but in its main features it is trustworthy. As an eminent English critic discerningly observes: "The Synoptic portrait of Jesus is not a product of the Church theology, but something that has survived in spite of it."

In the Synoptic Gospels Jesus appears as a person of overwhelming personality. He counts tremendously. All who come into contact with Him are moved, some to adoration, some to indignation. Some leave all and follow Him; others hate Him and feel that only His death can remove the menace of His personality. There were not a few in the "Jesus or Paul" controversy of the last century who viewed not Jesus but St. Paul as the real founder of Catholic Christianity. All will admit that St. Paul was the most powerful influence in propagating the Christian Religion in the Roman Empire. But that is not the point at issue. The point at issue is: What

is St. Paul's attitude towards Jesus? It is one of absolute self-abnegation. He calls himself the slave of Jesus Christ. (*Rom.*, I. 1; *Philip.*, I. 1). Paul's Gospel draws all its authority from Jesus: "Not I but the Lord" (*I Cor.*, VII. 10). His sole aim in life is "to press on, if so be that I may apprehend that for which I was also apprehended by Christ Jesus" (*Philip.*, III. 12). Although surrounded by hostile forces, angelic, demonic, astral, human, he is convinced that Jesus has power over all of them to deliver those who are loyal to Him. "I am," says he, "persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." (*Rom.*, VIII. 38, 39.) In that remarkable anonymous "word of exhortation" known as the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, the name Jesus occurs nine times, with special titles attached; and, as Westcott points out, "in every case it furnishes the key of the argument," and is used significantly on each occasion to unveil some fresh aspect of Him whom the writer is presenting as the Captain of our Salvation, Himself made perfect through sufferings. Now this attitude of St. Paul and of the writer of *Hebrews* is the attitude of all the primitive disciples whose writings we have in the New Testament. For instance, James, "the Lord's brother," also describes himself as the slave of Jesus (*James*, I. 1). It is equally the attitude of those whom they describe. The dying proto-martyr prays to Jesus: "Lord Jesus, receive my

spirit" (*Acts*, vii. 59). The apocalyptic seer, when he beholds Jesus in vision, falls at His feet as one dead (*Rev.*, i. 17). The doubting apostle in the latest Gospel is made to address Him as "My Lord and my God" (*John*, xx. 28).

The personality of Jesus dominates the primitive Church, and dominates it not merely with its wonderful majesty, as of one seated at the right hand of God, but also dominates it with its equally wonderful love. In the *First Epistle of St. Peter*, so essentially Christian in spirit, occurs that remarkable phrase, "Whom not having seen ye love" (*I Peter*, i. 8).

Even if the writings of the New Testament did not exist to afford overwhelming evidence of the tremendous impact of the personality of Jesus on His followers and their successors, what we know from our study of Comparative Religion would make this certain. The highest type of religion that exists in the world to-day is described as the *founded* religion. These founded religions trace their origin to a personal founder — a historic personage. These religions address themselves not to the tribe, nor to the citizens of kingdom or empire, but to the individual; they constitute societies of the like-minded; they organize themselves according to dominant spiritual and moral ideals. But where do these ideals come from? They are the ideals of the Founder of the Religion. He uttered them; He enshrined them in His personality and practice; they have the authority of His teaching and example behind them.

The oldest types of religion are apotheoses of the forces and processes of Nature; other later religions are apotheoses of social, national, and imperial ideals and ambitions; but the founded religions, the latest of all, are apotheoses of personality — the personality of the founder of the religion. Without the personality of the founder such a religion could not have come into existence: of such types are Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Mohammedanism, and Christianity. It is the misfortune of certain influential New Testament scholars that they seem to have had no leisure for these wider religious studies and so have failed to recognize the essential character of the Christian religion and its relation to the personality of its founder. It is interesting to note that Sir James Frazer, who, whatever his personal attitude towards Jesus may be, is as a student of religion surely unrivalled in the width and variety of his knowledge, is perfectly clear as to the relation of the personality of Jesus to Christianity. He writes:

The historical reality both of Buddha and of Christ has sometimes been doubted or denied. It would be just as reasonable to question the historical existence of Alexander the Great and Charlemagne on account of the legends that have gathered round them. The great religious movements which have stirred humanity to its depths and altered the beliefs of nations spring ultimately from the conscious and deliberate efforts of extraordinary minds, not from the unconscious coöperation of the multitude. The attempt to explain history without the influence of great men may flatter the

vanity of the vulgar, but it will find no favour with the philosophic historian.¹

One important reason for Christianity's triumph over the various mystery-cults, which were the most influential of its rivals, was that the Lord of the Christian Religion was a historic personage, whereas the heads of these cults were mythological. Jesus had come in the flesh; in Jesus His disciples claimed that they had handled (*ἐψηλάφησαν*)² real humanity. Christianity not only triumphed over the mystery religions because of that; it also, as the result of the same experience, resisted successfully the seductions of the theosophical Gnostic systems.

Christianity, as it has come into contact with other religions and civilizations in the course of its history, has accumulated a vast amount from them. This penetration of Christianity by practices and beliefs from external sources, some of which it has truly baptized into Christ, others of which are utterly alien to Christian principles, it is most important that we should realize and recognize. We are grateful to that thorough and courageous spirit of research which has indicated how early this process began and how far and deeply it has extended into Christianity; but these conclusions do not diminish the claim that Christianity is essentially the Religion of Jesus, and that it owes its origin to His personality. This then is the conviction of English Modernism, that Christianity is Jesuanity. The

¹ *The Golden Bough*, Part IV, "Adonis, Attis, Osiris" (3rd ed., 1919), i, 311.

² I *John*, I. I.

personality of Jesus is its source, its revelation, its inspiration. As the late Cyril Emmet said in concluding an article as valuable for its sound historical learning as for its weighty argument: "Jesus left no code, no book, no system: He only left Himself."¹

But I must add something more. Plutarch has preserved for us the inscription on a statue of Isis in the Egyptian city of Sais. It runs thus:

I am all that hath been, and that is, and that shall be, and no mortal hath ever raised my veil.

The Synoptic Gospels record that at the death of Jesus the Temple-veil which shrouded the Holy of Holies was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, thus teaching symbolically that it is the conviction of the Christian believer that he has in Jesus, His Personality, His Gospel, His Spirit, the unveiling of the Divine nature in its innermost moral and spiritual aspect.²

He was a ray (*ἀπαύγασμα*) from the Eternal Light; a reflection (*εἰκὼν*) of the Invisible God; the Divine Word (*λόγος*) immanent in the creative process but now at last manifested in its perfection in a human personality and manifested for the purpose of human salvation: "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself."

English Modernism, in contrast to Continental Modernism, whether Romanist or Liberal Protes-

¹ "What do we know about Jesus?" *Modern Churchman*, xi, 213-228.

² I owe this contrast to a paper by Dr. R. B. Tollinton published in the *Modern Churchman*, xi, 237.

tant, is characterized by its affirmation that we behold in Jesus *deitas sub specie humanitatis*; that He is, as the Nicene Creed affirms, of one substance (*ὁμοούσιος*) with the Father; that they who look into the face of Jesus Christ see in Him the very essence of the Creator's moral and spiritual nature. In its attitude towards Jesus, in its fundamental estimate of Jesus, English Modernism is united to primitive Christianity. It is in that respect essentially orthodox. It has therefore nothing in common with those who separate the Jesus of history from the Christ of Catholic worship. It has equally nothing in common with those who regard Jesus as a mythical personage, or with those who regard Him as historical, but as a comparatively unimportant factor in the origin of the Christian Religion.

From ecclesiastical formulæ and definitions, from theological disputes and speculations, from dry-as-dust investigations and critical minutiae, the English Modernist turns to the rich moral and spiritual content of the personality and teaching of Jesus, which surpasses in depth and insight all he has ever encountered in human history. As he experiences it he can express his conviction in the words of Luther: "*Hie(r) stehe ich. Ich kan(n) nicht anders. Gott helf mir. Amen*"; or, better still, in the words of Charles Wesley:

Weary of all this wordy strife,
These notions, forms, and modes, and names,
To Thee, the Way, the Truth, the Life,
Whose love my simple heart inflames,
Divinely taught, at last I fly,
With Thee and Thine to live and die.

Forth from the midst of Babel brought,
Parties and sects I cast behind:
Enlarged my heart, and freed my thought,
Where'er the latent truth I find,
The latent truth with joy to own,
And bow to Jesu's Name alone.

II

I must now show where and why English Modernists have been led to differ from popular traditionalist Christology. These differences were voiced with remarkable clearness and unanimity at the Modern Churchmen's Conference, held at Girton College, Cambridge, in 1921. Of the teaching of that Conference I wrote at the time:¹

It would be idle to pretend that all the views expressed at Girton are in harmony with popular orthodoxy, or even with traditional orthodoxy. All that those who expressed them could hope is that they may be in harmony with progressive orthodoxy. There is an orthodoxy which, by becoming stagnant, can become heresy, just as there is a religious devotion which, by refusing to become intelligent and moral, can become superstition. The Girton Conference speakers were more concerned to adjust their orthodoxy to the orthodoxy of the future, than to harmonize it with the orthodoxy of the past.

It was widely stated at the time, both in press and in pulpit, that the Modernists at Girton had denied the Deity of Jesus. This was not so. What was affirmed at that Conference was the Manhood of

¹ *Modern Churchman*, xi, 193.

Jesus, and His Deity as manifested in that Manhood under strictly human limitations.

This was not, of course, a novelty. It was an inference which might properly be drawn from Bishop Gore's pioneer work in modern Anglican theology,¹ when amid much opposition he domesticated in the theology of the English Church the doctrine of the Kenosis. It is true, I think, to observe that the Bishop did not at the time realize all the implications of his teaching, and has since opposed with vigour its fuller exposition and application; nevertheless, the credit is due to him of courageously teaching a view of the Person of Christ which seemed to offer the possibility of harmonizing that presentation of Jesus, which a rigorous historical criticism was constructing, with that conception of the eternal significance and value of His Personality in which the faith of the Church finds its security and inspiration.

Dean Rashdall, at the Girton Conference in 1921, read a paper entitled "Christ as Logos and Son of God," which gave rise to much controversy. The paper (published in the *Modern Churchman*, xi, 278-286) was later expanded into a small volume entitled *Jesus: Human and Divine*.² In it the Dean wrote as follows: "Jesus was in the fullest sense a man, as much so as any other human being, that He

¹ *The Incarnation of the Son of God* (Bampton Lectures), 1891. *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation* (1896).

² Published by Andrew Melrose (1922). Cf. Professor Bethune-Baker's article: "Jesus as both Human and Divine," in the *Modern Churchman*, xi, 287-301.

had not merely a human body, but a human soul, intellect, and will" (p. 13).

This growing realization of the perfect humanity of Jesus has had important effects on English Modernist Christology. It has led to the conviction that the Virgin Birth is not necessary to the Incarnation. This relation of the Virgin Birth to the Incarnation was made clear by Dean Armitage Robinson's letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, prefixed to his book, *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation*, published in 1903; but here again, as in Bishop Gore's case, the full implications were hardly grasped at the time. New Testament criticism had already begun to render the Virgin Birth insecure as a historical fact, for it had revealed three Christologies in the New Testament; or, if we prefer to put it in another way, three stages in the evolution of New Testament Christology.

(1) According to the first of these stages Jesus was the son, "according to the flesh" of Joseph, the carpenter of Nazareth, and Mary his wife, but became the Messiah, or Son of God in the Jewish sense, *by the anointing of the Holy Spirit* at his Baptism when, as St. Mark's Gospel relates, the Spirit entered into (*eis*) Him and He heard the Divine Voice say (in His heart, not in His ears), "Thou art my Son."¹ This is the type of Christology which is enshrined in the first twelve chapters of the *Acts*, for instance, in such phrases as "Jesus of Nazareth

¹ Possibly with the addition: "To-day have I begotten Thee," as in the Western Text of Luke. Cf. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, p. 143, etc.

a man approved of God unto you. . . . How that *God anointed Him* with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good . . . *for God was with Him*" (*Acts*, ii. 22 and x. 38), and was undoubtedly the Christology of the primitive apostolic Church of Jerusalem.

(2) The second stage of Christological evolution represents Jesus as the Son of God by a virgin birth — due to a Divine pre-natal creative act of the Holy Spirit. The account of this would appear to have been first published by St. Luke some time after 70 A.D., and shortly afterwards another account from a different point of view was published in the First Gospel.

One advantage of this Christology was that its acceptance did not necessitate the rejection of the early Christology. Both might be, and were as a matter of fact, combined.

(3) The third stage of Christological evolution is connected with Ephesus, as the first had been with Jerusalem and the second with Antioch. It appears in the prologue of the Fourth Gospel. The popular philosophical term *Logos*, used of the rational element in Nature and Man, was utilized to set forth the relationship of Jesus to the Divine Nature on the one hand, and to human nature on the other. This *Logos*, or Divine Reason, which is an essential element of the Divine Nature, and is described in Christian theology as "the indwelling Word" (*λόγος ἐνδιάθετος*), becomes operative and directive in the inception of the creative process as "the

Word proceeding forth" (λόγος προφορικός),¹ manifest at a later stage in that creative process in human personality as the rational and moral element in man, "the implanted Word" (λόγος σπερματικός),² and at a still later stage perfectly incarnated in Jesus of Nazareth as "the Word made flesh" (λόγος ἔνσαρκος).³

This Logos Christology appealed to the Greek mind, and did much in conjunction with other adaptations to help the Religion of Jesus to conquer the Greek world. It is also the form of New Testament Christology which appeals most to the English Modernist. It is true that like the so-called primitive Adoptionist Christology it stands in no need of the Virgin Birth; but that is not the chief advantage it possesses, although in the light of modern historical criticism it is a considerable advantage. Its greatest advantage is that it provides a way of thinking of the Incarnation of the Divine Nature in Jesus which not only makes no demand for miraculous interventions, but at the same time protects two dogmatic positions which at first sight appear to be mutually contradictory, namely, the Unity of the Godhead and the essential Deity of Jesus. This it does by asserting that the relation of men to God consists in man's possession of that moral, rational, and spiritual nature which is essentially Divine and is most perfectly perceived in

¹ Theophilus *Ad Autolycum*, ii.

² Cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, i, 46, and ii, 13.

³ In the Creeds, *σαρκωθέντα*, and this later was strengthened by *καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα*.

Jesus, Who is not only the unveiling or reflection of God to man, but also at the same time the human moral and spiritual ideal which man was created to achieve. Hence it is common possession of the Divine Logos, as manifested perfectly in Jesus, which constitutes the real relation between man and man as between man and God. The Logos Christology lends itself admirably to modern ways of thinking as seen in the doctrines of Creative Evolution and Divine Immanence. Though modern Christian, they are also ancient Christian, for we see the seeds of them at least in the Fourth Gospel and in the Epistles of St. Paul.

In holding fast to the Logos Christology, which, ever since the Fourth Gospel became canonical, has been the orthodox Christology of Christendom, English Modernism is maintaining that essential continuity of Christian thought which may not be sacrificed without loss.

III

There are, however, certain side-issues connected with that Christology which the Modernist feels strongly it would be in the interests of Christian truth and its influence in the modern world to have clearly stated.

(1) The first of these has reference to a type of teaching in the English Church which passes for orthodox but is really heretical. The Logos or Word of God is popularly presented in Church teaching as a psychological personality or mind. This the Logos is not, but a theological Person. If it be asked,

What is a theological Person? the English Modernist replies: I do not know precisely. Professor C. C. J. Webb cites Boethius's definition: *Persona est naturæ rationabilis individua substantia*, — "the individual substance of a rational nature," and this is followed by Aquinas. (S. T. I *quaest.* 29 *art.* i.)¹ Hence a theological Person is thought of by some as an eternal distinction or relation within the God-head; by others as a Divine mode of existence manifested in operation in the universe and in the world of human experience. The three Divine Persons — orthodox theology admits of neither more nor less than three — share the same Divine Nature, the same Divine Mind, the same Divine Will, but differ only in their hypostatic relations to each other and in their specific hypostatic functions.²

It is probably heretical to think of a theological Person simply as a Divine function or as a Divine mode of revelation. It is certainly heretical to define a theological Person as a personality, and to teach that the Three Persons are three minds. Yet the English Modernist knows that ninety-nine out of every hundred English Churchmen, not excluding the clergy, do in the name of Trinitarian teaching so divide the Unity of the God-head, and are guilty of the heresy of Tritheism. For this reason the Modernist wishes that the misleading term Person (hypostasis), which is never used in the New Testament in this way, were cut out of our English formu-

¹ Cf. Webb's, *God and Personality*, pp. 47 ff.

² See Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., *From a Friar's Cell* (1923), pp. 225 ff.

laries, or rather that the formularies which contain this ambiguous and misleading terminology were reverently laid aside. The chief offender in this case is the *Quicumque Vult*.

(2) The second side-issue connected with the Logos Christology is concerned with popular Church teaching about the preëxistence of Jesus, that is, the preëxistence of His human personality.

After the Girton Conference it became clear that the preëxistence of the human personality of Jesus was generally held and taught in English Church circles, and it required the powerful dialectic and weighty erudition of Dean Rashdall to convince those who regarded themselves as orthodox and him as heretical that, while it is orthodox to believe in the preëxistence of the Logos which is incarnated in Jesus, it is heretical to believe in the preëxistence of the human personality of Jesus.

In these two post-Girton issues English Modernism, which was represented at the time by the most eminent of the English theologians, stood for strict scholastic orthodoxy as against a popular Traditionalism which regarded itself as orthodox, but was ignorantly rather than obstinately and formally heretical.

There are, however, other issues connected with the Logos Christology which the English Modernist desires his Traditionalist brethren to reconsider. They are issues in which the Modernist is convinced, not that the essential truth is not enshrined in ancient orthodox formularies, but that the movement of modern thought demands some modification or expansion in the traditional formulation of it.

(1) The first concerns the formula of Chalcedon. The present Bishop of Manchester in 1912 described it as a confession of the bankruptcy of Greek Patristic Theology.¹

Now the essence of that formula is sound, namely, that Jesus Christ must be confessed to be both "perfect God" and "perfect Man." To confess Him as God exclusively is heresy.² To confess Him as Man exclusively is also heresy. For Christian orthodoxy as formulated at Chalcedon, Jesus Christ is both God and Man. With that conclusion the English Modernist has no quarrel: it is the very essence of his faith. Where he differs from ancient orthodoxy is in the way in which he conceives of this union of the two Natures in Christ. To say, as Chalcedonian orthodoxy does, that that union is not to be conceived of as a mixture, or as a mechanical juncture, or as a union which is temporary and terminable, but as a union which is hypostatic or personal receives his hearty consent; but to view this union of God and Man in Christ as uniting two distinct "substances" so that as a result you have in Christ two distinct spheres of consciousness and two wills such as you have in no normal human being, seems to the modern mind incredible and absurd. It is also without historical justification for the student of the Gospels. Such a theory seems to the modern man to

¹ *Foundations*, p. 230. Dr. Temple, in *Christus Veritas* (1924), p. 134n., has modified this statement by writing that it is the history of the controversy, not the formula, which leaves the impression of bankruptcy.

² I remember reading this notice in a Coptic Church in Egypt: "Give us money for the sake of our God, Jesus."

make orthodox theology responsible for producing a psychological monstrosity.

As Professor Bethune-Baker, the most eminent of living English dogmatic theologians, said at Girton:

Our technical definitions are frankly dualistic. They treat God and man as two distinct real existences ("substances"), each with its own special characteristics, which are incapable of being blended or fused into one, though in Jesus Christ they are so brought together and intimately related to each other that a "union" of both can be spoken of.¹

The late Dean Rashdall said at the same conference:

If "Divine" and "human" are thought of as mutually exclusive terms, if God is thought of as simply the Maker of man, if man is thought of as merely a machine or an animal having no community of nature with the Universal Spirit, who is the cause or source or "ground" of the existence alike of Nature and of other spirits, then indeed it would be absurd to maintain that one human being, and one only, was both God and man at the same time. But such a view of the relation between God and man would not at the present day be accepted by any philosophy which finds any real place for God in its conception of the universe.²

Now the English Modernist desires that English Theology shall jettison this incredible stuff. Orthodox theology provides all that is needful to secure a credible conception of the union of the two natures

¹ *Modern Churchman*, xi, 293.

² *Jesus: Human and Divine*, p. 17. Yet this view is generally considered to be orthodox by its holders. Also *Modern Churchman*, xi, 281.

in Christ, but this is not stressed in our Church teaching; it is implicit rather than, as it ought to be, explicit.

First, orthodox theology in the spirit of both the Old and the New Testament teaches that God and Man are not alien in Nature but akin. Man is potentially a Son of God: it is the Divine Will that man shall through Christ, the First Born of all creation (ὁ πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως), attain to all the fullness of life and perfection of nature which that kinship promises.

Secondly, orthodox theology (inspired by Origen) teaches the doctrine of the Eternal Generation of the Word. This eternal Generation of the Word ought not, however, to be limited to the Person of Jesus Christ, as it commonly is in orthodox circles, but should be extended to the whole world of finite intelligences. All these have their origin in God, every moment draw their life from Him, and share His Nature in various degrees. "In Him we live and move and have our being, for we are also His offspring," says the Apostle. God dwells in human beings in proportion as they respond to His creative energy and redeeming love.

In Jesus Christ we see perfectly exemplified the kinship of God and Man. In Jesus Christ we see the consummation of the Divine Indwelling in mankind. Thus do we see the Divine and Human united in Him under human limitations. Hence Jesus Christ is not best thought of as God and Man united, but as the God-Man, *deitas sub specie humanitatis*. From this it follows that the indwelling of God in Jesus Christ differs in degree, but not in

kind, from the Divine Indwelling in sons of men who are potentially sons of God.¹ The Pauline use of the word *pleroma* is very significant for Christology. It is used in four connections. (1) It is used of God (*Eph.*, III. 19, where it means "the totality of the Divine attributes"). (2) It is used of Christ, in whom it pleased the Father that this totality of the Divine attributes should dwell bodily (*Col.*, I. 19; II. 9). (3) It is used of the Church, the Body of Christ, which is endowed by Him with this Divine *pleroma* (*Eph.*, I. 23). (4) It is used of the individual Christian whose ideal end is that he may be filled with this *pleroma* of Divine gifts and graces (*Eph.*, III. 19; IV. 13; *Col.*, II. 10).

(3) The third side-issue connected with the Logos Christology concerns what are called the cosmological functions of the Word. In the Nicene Creed we say: "By whom all things were made." These words refer to the creative agency of the Divine Word. Now, when the Incarnation of the Word in Jesus Christ is spoken of, is it taken to mean that the whole of the Divine Logos (the λόγος ἐνδιαθετός, προφορικός, σπερματικός) became incarnated (ἐνσαρκος) in Jesus of Nazareth? That has certainly been the view of popular orthodoxy. We see it in the words of the Epiphany hymn:

Those mighty Hands that made the sky
 No earthly toil refuse;
 The Maker of the stars on high
 An humble trade pursues.

¹ See Dean Rashdall, *op. cit.*, p. 19, on the danger of saying absolutely, "Human nature is Divine," and stopping there.

This is a way of thinking of the Incarnation which is impossible for the modern mind. It is incredible. Moreover there is no evidence for it. There is nothing in our most authentic records of the life of Jesus to warrant the belief that Jesus of Nazareth during His earth life performed the cosmological functions of the Word; that He, while walking the streets and lanes of Galilee, was the operative centre, so to speak, of the Universe. Yet this is generally assumed. To doubt it, to contradict it, may be heretical. It is quite time that the difficulty was faced. The statement in the Prologue of the Fourth Gospel: "All things were made by Him"; the statement in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, "By whom also He made the worlds," and other theological, not historical, statements in the New Testament, may properly be interpreted of the Divine Word or Wisdom (Logos, Memra, or Kokhmah) manifest in the creative process in Nature and Man, which in the fullness of time was incarnated in Jesus of Nazareth, and in Him performed soteriological functions; but it cannot, the Modernist is convinced in the light of our modern historical and scientific knowledge, be asserted of Jesus of Nazareth that during his earth-life He was performing the cosmological functions of the Word.

(4) Another side-issue of the Logos Christology needs reconsideration. It was one of the conclusions of the notable recapitulation theory of St. Irenæus that the purpose of the Incarnation was to restore in man the Image of God in which he had been created, but which had been defaced by the Fall. This idea

of human restoration and renovation is common to all the great patristic theologians; it was not peculiar to them; we find it in the Jewish apocalyptists; indeed, we find it in pagan writers — a good example of this is Eclogue IV (the Pollio) of Vergil.¹ This is due to all these writers' believing in a golden age at the dawn of human history, which our anthropologists have shown to be a figment of the imagination, the *laudator temporis acti* complex. The Golden Age, if such there be, will be found in the consummation of human history, not at its beginning. Adam, of whom Dr. South declared that Aristotle, the mightiest mind of antiquity, was but the rubbish; Eve, whom John Milton set forth as the fairest of all her daughters, were never the handiwork of the Creator; they are but the creation of human imagination. The Divine Image was far less manifest in palæolithic man than in his modern descendants. The view of the Incarnation which sees it as operating to restore an obliterated Divine Image in man, must give place to that modern interpretation of it which views it as an epoch-making event that has contributed to the creation of man in the Divine Image — a process still far from final accomplishment, but which Christian Faith is assured shall yet be realized in and through Christ.

(5) There is a fifth side-issue connected with the Logos Christology, to which I must refer. In the English Church, since the publication of Dr. Inge's Bampton Lectures on *Christian Mysticism* and Dr. Illingworth's volume on *Divine Immanence*, there

¹ See Conington's Notes, *ad loc.*

has been a growing acceptance of the view that belief in the Divine Transcendence must be balanced by belief in the Divine Immanence. Besides the English theologians, the English poets with their love of Nature (especially Wordsworth), the English scientists with their theory of Evolution, the English philosophers, especially the Hegelians, have all contributed to this growing belief in the Divine Immanence. Hence English Modernists have been led to assume that Incarnation is a particular form of Immanence. When the creative operation of the Logos reaches the stage at which the Logos becomes perfectly immanent in the form of human personality, the operation may be spoken of as Incarnation. In Jesus the Logos found a perfect organon for the purpose of Incarnation, an organon in which the fullness (*πλήρωμα*) of the God-head was able to dwell under human limitations; in others the Incarnation falls far short of this perfection. Since, nowever, the Incarnation in Jesus, an impulse has been given to the process of Incarnation which promises that manifestation of the Sons of God to which St. Paul looked forward (*Rom.*, VIII. 17). This seems to English Modernists to be the most satisfactory way of thinking of the relation of Divine Immanence to Divine Incarnation. If this be so, it is important that the Church authorities should recognize it and state it. If it be not so, it is incumbent to show why not. In any case the point requires serious and open-minded investigation.

(6) There is one other side-issue of the Logos Christology which, some English Modernists feel,

needs to be investigated, and that is the relation of the Holy Spirit to the Logos. The doctrine of the Spirit existed in the primitive Church before the doctrine of the Logos. The primitive Christian regarded the Spirit as performing many of those functions which a later theology regarded as the functions of the Logos. The confusion has arisen through superimposing a Greek theology on a Jewish theology. As the result of the stir caused by the Girton Conference of 1921, the Church of England authorities appointed a representative Commission¹ to investigate theological differences and to suggest modes of reconciliation. The Commission has not yet completed its work. It is to be hoped that those theological issues which Modernists have drawn attention to will be fearlessly faced by the Commission. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. He constitutes the unchangeable element in the Church's faith, but there are portions of the traditional Christology which need reformulation. Unfortunately the Church authorities have too often mistaken the formularies for the essentials of the faith, and have seemed to act as if they supposed that the formularies were once for all delivered to the saints and that they may not be discarded or amended or expanded. As Dean Rashdall said:

It is a profound historical mistake — a pure mistake of fact — to suppose that the Church's teaching has always been the same on all subjects. The Church would

¹ See Appendix for Report recently issued.

have been dead long ago if it had been, and the promise that the Holy Spirit would ever lead the Church on to new truth would have failed. The Church has always — and most of all in the ages in which its influence has been most vital — been adapting its teaching to meet the advance of knowledge in other directions.¹

IV

English Modernists desire the English Church authorities to grant the three following concessions in the teaching of Christology.

(1) That the *fact* of the Incarnation should be recognized as something quite distinct from the *mode* of the Incarnation.

Faith in the *fact* of the Incarnation is of the very essence of Christian Faith. But while the foundation of every Christian Christology is the conviction that there has been a supreme Incarnation of the Divine Nature in the personality of Jesus of Nazareth, there is no single *mode* of the Incarnation that is so undoubted and authoritative that the Church can demand that the teacher of any other mode must be faced with the alternatives of recantation or deprivation.

There is need for clear and authoritative decision by the Church in this matter. At present most English people hold that the Church in its Christology is tied down to the mode of the Virgin Birth — a mode which historical research and scientific methods of thought are rendering incredible to an increasing number of educated people who unfortunately

¹ *Jesus: Human and Divine*, p. 80.

do not realize that belief in the Incarnation is not dependent upon belief in this particular mode of it.

(2) That it may be conceded by the Church authorities that it is perfectly legitimate to teach that Incarnation is a higher form of Divine Immanence, and that the Indwelling of the Divine Logos in Jesus Christ is no isolated event, but the culmination of an age-long creative process which it is the Divine Will should be accomplished in others through Him. Justin Martyr did not hesitate to affirm that every human personality is a seed of the Logos (*Apol.*, ii, 8); St. Athanasius did not shrink from declaring that Christ became human that He might make men divine. (*Orat.*, i. 30; ii. 3, 9.)

But there is no need to go to the Fathers of the Church when we have in the New Testament such great sentences as these:

But as many as received Him to them gave He the right to become children of God. (*John*, i. 12).

Forasmuch then as the children [that is, of God] are partakers of flesh, He also Himself likewise took part in the same. (*Heb.*, ii. 14.)

He that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one [that is, out of One, namely God], for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren. (*Heb.*, ii. 11.)

If children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ. (*Rom.*, viii. 17.)

Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the children of God. (I *John*, iii. 1.)

Beloved, now are we children of God . . . and we know . . . that we shall be like Him. (I *John*, iii. 2.)

Whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and my sister and mother. (*Mark*, III. 35.)

The affinity of the Divine and human, which is the very essence of the Gospel of Jesus, has been lost sight of in our Church theology. It is part of the lost radiance of the Christian Religion. There is tremendous need for its restoration, for it constitutes the ground of all our deeper thought to-day. I venture to cite one whose claim to be heard on this point is much greater than my own.

The late Dr. Fairbairn in his work *Christ in Modern Theology* (4th edition, pp. 472 f.) wrote:

The affinities of the natures divine and human may be said to be the common principle of our higher philosophies. It was implied in Descartes' attempt to educe from the nature and contents of his own mind, the evidence for the being of the Infinite; as also in Spinoza's endeavour to resolve the phenomena of space and time, matter and thought, into the modes of a single substance, which was at once a *res extensa* and a *res cogitans*. The same may be said of Malebranche's theory of the vision of all things in God, and Berkeley's doctrine of nature as a visual language, which was spoken by the creative and translated by the created spirit. The relation of Kant's subjective forms and categories to the interpretation of nature, and of his dialectic to the transcendental ideal, implies, in spite of his own negative criticism, the correspondence or reciprocity of the interpretative mind with the interpreted reality. Schelling's Absolute Identity and Hegel's Absolute Idealism meant the same thing; and it has passed into current thought, philosophical, and religious, as the doctrine of the Divine Immanence. . . . God is, as it were, the eternal

possibility of being incarnated, man the permanent capability of incarnation.¹

(3) That it may be conceded by the English Church authorities that it is lawful to teach that the difference between the Incarnation of the Logos in Christ and in us is a difference not of kind but of degree. Some have urged that such a concession would inevitably make Christian theology Pantheistic. Anyone who will consult Pringle-Pattison's Gifford Lectures, *The Idea of God in the Light of Recent Philosophy*, will find convincing proof that a belief in the kinship of God and Man may be held in a form which is in strong opposition to Pantheism. No modern English theologian was more conscious of the dangers of Pantheism than Dr. Rashdall, and he held this view. Of course, while human beings have the ineffable and incomprehensible privilege of being potentially sons of God, and of becoming fellow-heirs with Christ (*Rom.*, VIII. 17), and finally of sharing in all the fullness (*πλήρωμα*) of the Divine Nature (*Eph.*, III. 19), it does not mean that these are ours already, nor can they be so in the future without an immense process of purification, illumination, and development. This Divine Sonship is potential, not actual, and Aristotle's golden sentence also applies in this case: "The true nature of a thing is that which it is when its becoming is completed."

¹ A recent book *Immanence and Incarnation* by S. F. Davenport, published by the Cambridge University Press (1925), is directed against the view that Incarnation admits of degrees and can take place more than once in human history. Mr. Davenport's confutation however seems extremely unconvincing.

Some will say: Why trouble about an accurate Theology and Christology? It is sufficient to have a Religion. As intelligent persons we must have a Theology and a Christology, if we believe in God and in Jesus Christ. All that is needful is that these 'ologies shall be as truthful and as simple as possible. If they be not truthful, they will not convince. If they be not simple, they will not be understood.

But while it is needful to have a truthful Theology and Christology, it is very important to emphasize that intellectual assent to propositions is worth very little in comparison with ethical loyalty to a person or ideal. That is perfectly clear from the teaching of Jesus. The Reverend C. F. Russell, a well-known English Modernist and the Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge in 1923, brings this out very clearly in his reply to the question: Who is it to-day who believes in the Divinity of Christ? He answers:

Is it not the man whose whole soul goes out in un-reserving acceptance of the supremacy of love? Such a definition would include many who do not assume the name of Christian; many who, because they stumble at the creeds, would feel, and might even be told, that they had no place at a Christian eucharist; many who within the last few years have fought and died for an ideal, for the love of country, for the love of comrades, and yet have stood resolutely outside the churches. Can we doubt that such men acknowledge the Divinity of Christ in the only way in which He would Himself wish such acknowledgment to be made the test of discipleship? The majesty of love has them in thrall.

(*Modern Churchman*, xi, 628.)

For us as Christians, the practical question is not: How did God become man? nor is it: Is Jesus Christ God? It is: What is God like in His moral and spiritual nature? For the Christian, Jesus Christ is the answer to that question. Here both Traditionalists and Modernists are in absolute agreement. St. Philip, in the Fourth Gospel, is recorded to have said, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." And Christ replied, "He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father." Why should the Traditionalist demand more from the Modernist than sufficed an Apostle?

XII

MODERNISM AND THE CREEDS

Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the Will of My Father which is in heaven. — *Jesus Christ.*

A mightier Church shall come, whose covenant word
Shall be the deeds of Love. Not *credo* then,
Amo shall be the password through her gates.

I

THE Creeds constitute not one of the least of the problems of the English Modernist. They arouse a multitude of questions.

Are creeds necessary? If they are necessary, what creeds come in this class? The creeds of the great General Councils, like the Nicene Creed, or even more ancient creeds like the primitive baptismal creed, the Apostles' Creed?

Should there be only one creed for all Christendom, or may different national or local churches have their own creeds?

Is it permissible to compose modern creeds and to use them?

What features or aspects of Christian Faith should the creeds deal with? Should they deal with the philosophy of the Christian Faith, or be confined to its historical aspect, or to its mystical experience and religious convictions, or to its ethical demands? Is any creed satisfactory which does not

include all these aspects of the Christian Religion? How ought the creeds to be used? Ought they to be confined to Baptism as in the primitive Church, or should they be used liturgically as at the Eucharist, or should they be used for purposes of subscription in connection with ordination, or would it be best that they should be used devotionally and be chanted as psalms, or sung as anthems? ¹

These aspects of the need for creeds, the nature of creeds, and the use of creeds have been discussed by English Modernists for years. Another set of problems has arisen about the interpretation of creeds.

May the interpretation vary from age to age, or must it be always that which it was at the first? Should interpretation be literal or liberal, or may some articles of the creed be interpreted liberally, and must others be interpreted literally? How far may a Modernist interpretation extend? May it go to the verge of negation, or must it affirm the essence of the affirmation and be free only to discard or alter the non-essential element, or, as some would say, to affirm the *fact* but to discard the *mode*?

These last queries I have answered briefly in my section on the English Modernist's attitude towards Dogma.

All are agreed that a creed is necessary: a Church must have a creed or some verbal declaration of its faith. Christian history affirms this conclusion.

¹ Dean Inge advised: "I should keep the *Te Deum* and drop the 'Three Creeds.'" Professor Otto wrote to me from Germany before the War, suggesting that the best way of using the Apostles' Creed is as a chorale. This has been done in some German churches.

From the earliest times the Church has had its creed. At first it was very simple and very brief: "Jesus is the Messiah," "Jesus is the Lord," "Jesus is the Son of God." Affirmation of this creed was the necessary preliminary to admission by the rite of Baptism into the Christian Church. Hence the earliest creeds are baptismal creeds.

Probably the earliest baptismal creed we possess is that in the Laudian *Acts* in the Bodleian Library at Oxford — the declaration of faith of the Treasurer of Queen Candace (as translated in the Authorized Version, *Acts*, VIII. 37): "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."¹ The baptismal creed grew. Various things assisted its growth. The baptismal creed became the basis — the syllabus, as we should say, for the instruction of converts or catechumens as a necessary preliminary for baptism. The Creed was "delivered" (*traditio symboli*) in catechizing, and "returned" (*redditio symboli*) at Baptism. But it was found that Gentile pagan converts required more instruction than Jews and Jewish proselytes. Hence the article, "I believe in God the Father," was added to the creed.

Various teachers known as Gnostics began very early to expound theologies alien to primitive Jewish Christianity, but into which they fitted Jesus Christ, not as Messiah, but as an emanant æon of their Divine Pleroma. The Church authorities expelled these Gnostic teachers and their followers,

¹ This is omitted by older and more reliable codices, and is plainly a marginal gloss based on contemporary liturgical practice and was later included in the text of *Acts*.

and inserted clauses into the Baptismal creed which contradicted their heresies: for example, "Maker of heaven and earth," for some of these heretical teachers held that matter was uncreate and eternal, and others held that it was created by an inferior deity; "born of the Virgin Mary" was inserted because these Gnostics taught that Jesus had only a phantasmal body and thereby deprived Him of full humanity. These baptismal creeds varied in form in different localities. The Apostles' Creed, which is the ancient baptismal creed of the Church of Rome, differed in some respects, as Rufinus, presbyter of Aquileia, pointed out in his fourth-century commentary on it, from the baptismal creed in the Church of Aquileia, although closely akin to it in contents and structure. The Eastern creeds differed considerably from the Western creeds. The mind of the English Churchman is enlarged in the matter of creeds, when, after the study of his Prayer-Book and the XXXIX Articles, which speak of three creeds, he reads perchance Hahn's *Bibliothek der Symbole* and becomes acquainted with nearly two hundred and fifty Christian creeds belonging to the first seven centuries. Hence, while it seems needful to the English Modernist that the Church should have a baptismal creed, it does not seem necessary that the baptismal creeds of different local churches should all agree in details. Agreement only in certain great essentials seems needful. What are these essentials?

Here the English Modernist is disposed to follow his Church Catechism, which summarizes the teach-

ing of the Baptismal Creed in its answer to the question: What dost thou chiefly learn from the articles of thy belief?

First, I learn to believe in God the Father, who hath made me, and all the world.

Secondly, in God the Son, who hath redeemed me, and all mankind.

Thirdly, in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me, and all the elect people of God.

II

But the Modernist, when he goes on with his investigation into the fourth century, becomes aware of the existence of a new kind of creed in addition to the Baptismal Creed.

This creed is an Ecumenical Creed—a creed which is not the product of a local church, but of the whole church—a creed composed by a General Council. The first of these General Councils was held at Nicæa in A.D. 325. Its creed was composed to settle the Church's doctrine on certain disputed points. It was deliberately intended to exclude heretical teachers, and for this reason it became a creed to be subscribed to by Christian bishops. Those who would not subscribe to it were deposed from their office.

A few centuries later the Modernist finds that creeds are being used liturgically and that a favourite creed for this purpose in Western monastic institutions is a metrical dogmatic composition called the Faith of Saint Athanasius, which, though certainly

not written by that saint, was believed to express his teaching in opposition to Arianism. This composition is used liturgically with its attached anathemas. This liturgical use of anathemas is something of a novelty. The creeds of the General Councils had anathemas attached to them, but these never appear to have been used liturgically.

The English Modernist feels that there are insuperable objections to the use of anathemas in Divine Worship to-day — that, for instance, is why he objects to the liturgical use of “the cursing Psalms.” It introduces a jarring note which accords ill with the spirit of devotion. It stresses unduly the importance of dogmatic formulæ and unwavering adherence to them. These dogmatic formulæ in their precision go far beyond our Lord’s teaching and the words of Holy Scripture; and to demand that they should be accepted on peril of eternal damnation is a policy which seems to the Modernist to create a counter-dogmatism and to invite repudiation. It creates a reaction. It is claimed by Roman Catholic controversialists that Dr. Little-dale’s *Plain Reasons against joining the Church of Rome* has been more fruitful in producing converts to Romanism than any book written on the Roman side. The public recitation of the *Quicumque Vult* has been most fruitful in the production of Unitarians and Tritheists, where it has not been the means of repelling people from Christianity altogether by what they regard as its arrogant and intolerant dogmatism. It is for these reasons that English Modernists urge that it be no longer pre-

scribed for recitation in the Church Services;¹ and have been amazed at the prolonged resistance offered to this essentially reasonable proposal.

Their attitude towards the Apostles' Creed as a baptismal formula is sympathetic. Its great antiquity and its origin and development in connection with the Christian Baptism in the Western Church have made them loath to abolish its use. It stands for them like some ancient Saxon or Norman Font, — a sacred thing dedicated from immemorial ages to a primitive church rite, — and he must have the heart of a Vandal and the taste of a Philistine who would cast it forth. It is true that the ancient font in our parish churches is not used precisely as our forefathers used it. Infants are no longer plunged thrice into its sacred flood; instead, a few drops of its water lave their forehead. So too with the Baptismal Creed. Modernists have no desire that that creed shall be rigorously used and a literal assent demanded from the baptized person or his proxies to each article. The creed is to be affirmed in the Baptismal Service in the general sense in which it is expounded in the Catechism. For that reason the Modernist, while willing to retain the Apostles' Creed at Baptism, would prefer to see its use changed there. He would rather have a preliminary question put, dealing with Christian Faith in that

¹ The best defence, with which I am acquainted, for the liturgical retention of the *Quicumque Vult* is that by Professor F. C. Burkitt, *Some Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed* (S.P.C.K.), 1916. This had appeared in longer form in his booklet, *The Failure of Liberal Christianity* (Bowes and Bowes, 1910), and was replied to by Dean Rashdall, very convincingly, in the *Modern Churchman*, i, 1.

simple and general way in which Christian Renunciation and Christian Obedience are treated in our present Baptismal service; and as soon as the Baptism is completed and the brow of the baptized signed with the cross, he would then have all turn to the East, in accordance with a custom which goes back probably to the first century, and recite together the Apostles' Creed.

The Modernist does not favour its retention in the Catechism, nor that children be taught to learn it by heart; nor does he favour its public recitation at the daily or Sunday services. The objection to this latter custom is that the Apostles' Creed used in this way gives a one-sided impression of the *obligations* of the Christian. It seems to make the Christian religion a matter of holding fast the traditional Christian belief in the traditional form; it seems to stress assent to a series of propositions as constituting the main obligation of the Christian life. It says nothing of Christian renunciation and Christian obedience. It omits all reference to Christian practice. It is not — to use a phrase of one of our English Modernists, the Reverend Harold Anson — “a creed to make profiteers feel uncomfortable.” It is, as Cardinal Newman once plaintively remarked, a creed which Dives feels it no harder to accept than does Lazarus. This is very unsatisfactory. Hence, if it be desirable to have a declaration of Christian obligation recited by all at daily or weekly public worship, then it is necessary to have something more comprehensive and more practical than the Baptismal Creed. It must contain not only a decla-

ration of Christian faith, which is a wider and deeper thing than Christian belief, but also declarations of Christian duty and Christian experience. Those English Modernists certainly have right on their side who demand a strong ethical element in such a declaration. The Christian Religion as it came from Jesus Christ was a supremely ethical religion.¹ His words: "Why call ye my Lord! Lord! and do not the things that I say," ring down the ages, as the utterance of One Who, in the Spirit of the great prophets of Israel, demanded deeds not words, righteousness not ritual, conduct not creed.

Whether the formulation of such a creed be needful or desirable is an open question. If one be composed, it will probably be desirable that there should be others composed also, to be used as alternatives. It is thought that it is hardly likely that any modern composition could seem entirely satisfactory or receive general consent. Some Modernists have felt this so strongly that they have urged that such a formula should be composed entirely, if possible, in the words of Holy Scripture, as alone likely, on the ground of sacredness and authority, to seem worthy of recitation for such a solemn purpose.

Other English Modernists would prefer that each Christian should derive his own creed from the study of the New Testament. Their attitude is that of the well-known eighteenth-century Latitudinarian, Bishop Watson (of Carlisle), who, when asked, "What is the Christian Faith?" replied: "I should wish rather to tell you where it may be found.

¹ This view is also taken by Sir James Frazer.

It is," said he, laying his hand on the Bible, "to be found here." There are obvious objections to prescribing the New Testament for this purpose. Its bulk, and the difficulties connected with its exegesis, preclude its use as a Christian formulary.

A creed seeks to unite, and really does unite, those who profess it. The tendency of the Bible, even of the New Testament, appears to be to disunite its readers and students, to judge by the fissiparous character of the reformed communions.

There are others who would limit the creed to the words of our Lord, and on the principle that *lex orandi* is *lex credendi* would constitute the Lord's Prayer the Christian creed. Others would prefer the Eight Beatitudes. Others would substitute the two great commandments: "Thou shalt love the Lord Thy God, with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself." Some have viewed such creeds with disapprobation as not distinctively Christian. It is affirmed that Jews and Mohammedans and even Buddhists have been willing to unite with Christians in their recitation. Perhaps the coming Catholicism will not regard this as an insuperable objection to their use. It seems more than doubtful whether our Lord would have done so; and, as a certain American Dean once remarked, "There is no need to be more orthodox than Jesus Christ."

When a *distinctively* Christian creed is demanded, what is too often meant is an *exclusively* Christian creed — a creed which will exclude those who are

not regarded by others as Christians, although regarding themselves as such. We rather doubt whether such a creed can be Christian.

In January, 1921, with the purpose of discovering the views of English Modernists, I sent out to twenty-four leading Modernists the four questions issued by the World Conference of Faith and Order (the outcome of the Geneva Conference) and requested an answer to them. The questions were as follows:

1. What degree of unity in Faith will be necessary in a reunited Church?
2. Is a statement of this one Faith in the form of a Creed necessary or desirable?
3. If so, what Creed should be used? or what other formulary would be desirable?
4. What are the proper uses of a Creed and of a Confession of Faith?

I received nineteen replies, eight from laymen and eleven from clergymen. Those not acquainted with the life of Christian communities might have supposed that the laity would have taken more radical views in their replies than the clergy. This was not so. The only two women asked vouchsafed no reply. The answers are worth attention and I give them in an Appendix (I).

A perusal of them indicates that some are opposed to a creed; others would admit a creed, for preference an ancient historic creed liberally interpreted; others would have it also reëdited; others would substitute the *Te Deum*; others favour a very simple modern creed. After very carefully weighing all the

issues raised, I have come to the conclusion that, having in view the great problem of Christian reunion, it would be best to retain the Nicene Creed (so-called) for recitation at the Eucharist. For this purpose it should be reëdited, at least to the extent of substituting the ancient "We believe," for "I believe," and eliminating the *filioque*¹ clause, thus not only expelling a later unauthorized interpolation, but also making the form acceptable to the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Many would also like to see the Virgin-Birth clause excised, as it was not in the original Nicene Creed. The use of this creed at the Eucharist should be regarded not so much as an expression of individual belief as an act of devotion proclaiming the historic faith of the Universal Church of Christ. Hence its use would constitute a link both between the past and the present, and between present-day English-speaking Christians and Christians of other communions all the world over. In such a case there ought to be accorded the freest interpretation of the Creed. Some would interpret it in the sense in which its clauses were originally understood historically and theologically. They would be very few indeed. Others would interpret its clauses in the light of modern philosophy, science, and historical criticism. This is what takes place in the case of the Lord's prayer. Some interpret the

¹ This clause, which states that the Holy Ghost proceeds "from the Son" as well as from the Father, was inserted on the authority of a Spanish provincial Council in the sixth century. In the Eastern Orthodox Churches it is maintained that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *through* the Son; the Father is the sole source of the Spirit, the Son is the agent or means of the Procession of the Spirit.

phrase, "Thy Kingdom come," in the eschatological sense of the primitive Christian expectation of a cataclysmic end of this world, while others interpret it as the gradual penetration of all human organizations and activities by the Spirit of Christ. No one, because his interpretation differs in this case, regards the other as heretical, and that is because the Church has an official ecumenical prayer, but has no official interpretation of it. This ought to be the case with the Nicene Creed. There should be no official interpretation of it. Let it suffice that all use it, and let each interpret it as he thinks right.

There remains the use of a creed as a formulary of subscription by those who are appointed to be leaders, teachers, and rulers of the Church. Do English Modernists hold clerical subscription to be necessary and desirable to-day? I believe that they do not, and that for three reasons.

First, they believe in discipline, namely, that the clergy should promise to use in the public services of the Church the liturgical forms prescribed and none other unless when precisely permitted by lawful authority. This protection of the services protects the Church's message. The authority that prescribes the Church's liturgy really prescribes its doctrine.

Secondly, they believe in education. The greatest safeguard to Christian truth is a properly educated clergy. Where there has been a thorough study of Christian origins and history, where the continuity of Christian thought has been understood and the character of Christian spiritual and moral experi-

ence appreciated by the clergy, there need be little apprehension of any serious departure from the essential form of Christian truth. There may be much freedom of speculation by such teachers, but it will be found that the fundamentals of the Christian faith will be advocated by them both in word and deed.

Thirdly, the Modernists believe in the power of truth to prevail; this is not only because truth is the ideal expression of reality, but also because human nature is essentially rational, moral, and spiritual, and we may hope in the course of human evolution that it will become increasingly so.

The advice of Gamaliel to the Sanhedrim is valid. It is the only sound policy to adopt in the presence of teaching which conflicts with traditional orthodoxy. "If this be of God, ye will not be able to overthrow it; lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God." (*Acts*, v. 39.) Our Lord's parable of the wheat and the tares enforces the same policy. "Let both grow together until the harvest." The test of true or right teaching is manifest in its effect on human character and conduct. Unchristian and anti-christian teaching will not win for any length of time, nor in any large measure, the *anima humana* which Tertullian declared to be *naturaliter Christiana*. It will wither and droop; Christian men will turn from it; it will not secure the *consensus fidelium*. It may start with a flourish of trumpets and with the acclamations of multitudes but unless it be true it has no future.

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,
 The eternal years of God are hers,
 But Error wounded writhes in pain
 And dies amid his worshippers.

Or, as it is expressed even more nobly in John Milton's prose:

For who knows not that Truth is strong next to the Almighty? She needs no policies, no stratagems, nor licencings to make her victorious. . . . Give her but room.

In the face of these three considerations the thought of guarding Christian truth by clerical subscription seems futile. The fact that extreme Anglo-Catholics, extreme Evangelicals, and extreme Modernists all subscribe the same formularies in the Church of England, shows of what little use subscription is for the purpose of securing uniformity of belief or literal interpretation of common doctrinal formularies. Of course, ever since the form of subscription was altered by Act of Parliament in 1865 ¹ so as to render subscription as comprehensive as possible, there has been no zest for its retention, even by fanatical Anglicans. Some Modernists feel that it is now so relaxed that it is not worth the effort to abolish it. Other Modernists would be glad to see it abolished, if only because it does press on certain sensitive consciences in the case of young men who may be contemplating ordination. In such cases it

¹ See Dean Stanley's *Essays in Church and State* for particulars of the significance of the alterations in the form of subscription effected by this Act.

seems extremely unsatisfactory to say to them that the Church authorities require them to subscribe, but really, since the form of subscription has been relaxed, it means very little. That situation does not jar upon philosophically-minded men of middle-age who are able, in Plato's phrase, to take a synoptic view of things, but to enthusiastic, loyal-hearted, morally sensitive young persons it seems repellent. Nevertheless, the number of English Modernists is very small who feel this to be a sufficiently strong reason for abolishing subscription, in view of the practical difficulties which its abolition would entail.

The Modernist interpretation of the ancient creeds sticks in the throat, not simply of rigid Traditionalists, but of plain men who are, it may be, Agnostics, Atheists, Unitarians, or Quakers. It revolted the soul of "honest John Morley" and of Professor Henry Sidgwick as much as it does that of Lord Halifax or Father Woodlock, S.J.

Professor Kirsopp Lake seems to touch the point of the problem with a needle when he remarks: "I have myself sometimes wondered whether it would be simpler to say that the Creed is wrong and cease affirming it." ¹ Yes, it *would* be simpler, but that is hardly the right way to put it. The question is whether it would be better, especially in an age of transition which recognizes on the one hand the preciousness of the heritage of the Christian past and on the other hand the present inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Might it not be better to unite with our Christian brethren in saying the ancient Creed

¹ In his Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality.

as a declaration of our unity with our Christian ancestors and also with our Christian brethren all the world over, and yet hold ourselves free in our pulpits and classes to teach, if needs be, that many of those ancient articles in the Creed have changed, and must change, their significance for Christian believers with the passage of the ages? So long as there is a free pulpit there can, on the score of clerical honesty, — mental and moral integrity, — be no objection to the public recitation or chanting of a traditional creed. When the great bulk of Christians desire that the traditional creed shall cease to be used, or another be substituted for it, it will then be the time to dispense with it. Archdeacon William Danks, afterwards a Canon of Canterbury, who shared John Morley's political creed and respected his personal integrity, showed in the *Hibbert Journal* the inconsistency of Morley's condemnation of clerical subscription. Morley, to the best of my knowledge, did not reply, and I am inclined to believe that that was because there was no effective answer to Archdeacon Danks's argument. It is very easy to speak sententiously of "honesty in the use of language" and "the importance of saying what we mean and meaning what we say," but there are many occasions when we have mutually agreed, without any purpose of deception, not to do so. It is quite possible to make our meaning perfectly clear to our fellow Christians without putting it into a form of words which will make it so to the outsider, the Philistine, and the hero of the wild and woolly West. In our Christian worship the soul is not

speaking *urbi et orbi*; it speaks to God and to other Christian souls — *cor ad cor loquitur*. We are not then addressing the sceptic, the pagan, or the ignoramus — we are addressing those who know.

The Modernist argument for a free interpretation of the creeds as against a literal interpretation is best studied in the controversy between Professor Henry Sidgwick and Dr. Hastings Rashdall (afterwards Dean of Carlisle) in the *International Journal of Ethics* in 1896 and 1897.¹

Dr. Bernard Bosanquet's summing up makes the Modernist position impregnable. He points out that the importance attached by the disputants to documents upsets the balance of the discussion, and concludes thus:

I do not believe that the problem of remaining or not remaining a minister of a certain church ought to be represented primarily by the question of believing or not believing in some of the documents in which it (the Church) requires belief to be professed. I do not think that this is the primary question even for the most critically minded.

[That question is] whether reading together the various formularies and accepted expressions of the Church's doctrine, and considering its history and present work and aims, its cause seems one desirable to promote, and one in promoting which the individual could find his best life work. In reviewing this question, anyone would give weight to such a fact as that formularies, to him obsolete, have to be recited by him in the ritual with an

¹ Sidgwick's articles are also published in his *Practical Ethics* (1898), and reviewed by Bosanquet in the *International Journal of Ethics*.

expression of belief. But to anyone who has been able to decide the main question in the affirmative, the question of veracity would be so greatly modified as to present little difficulty.

There in tones of English culture speaks English common sense, unveiling the spirit of the English people whose lode-star is life not logic, and whose policy is that of practical compromise, not that of *doctrinaire* consistency. Bosanquet's verdict agrees with that of John Stuart Mill. For one who feels towards his Church as does the writer of the following citation, the question of the exact sense in which the articles of her Creed are to be interpreted will really matter very little.

I am at home in this Church of England. I love it. The sacred influences of my life dawned within its fold. The memories of my childhood, of my first home, of my first attachments, are steeped in its benediction. Snatches from its liturgy, mottoes from its walls, legends from its windows, the awe of its music, the peace of its sanctuary — these woke the better man in me, gave me my first ideals, spelt out my first watchwords, introduced me to the things most high. If heaven lies about us in our infancy, heaven broke through the veil to me sacramentally in the worship of that wonderful Church. It spoke to me. The peal of its bells and the accents of its prayer and praise yet reverberate from those old days in the corridors of my remembrance with a lifelong, incomparable charm. For me that Church has never failed. Early and late, from youth to middle age, the Church of my fathers has been to me the channel of wisdom and grace and has fed with divine nutrition my ultimate needs. . . .

I believe in the spirit of the Church of England — the spirit which through fifteen hundred years and more projected, adumbrated the doctrines. There is a soul in this august institution. That soul has stammered out its own unspeakable experience through the centuries in liturgies, hymnodies, theologies, confessions, homilies, debates.

These lisping notes of the intelligence are the language of the soul — a language which in dim degree, tentatively, fallibly, variably intimates the experience within, the life hid with Christ in God of the society. The language intimates the experience, conserves it, transmits it; is a vessel in which the experience is held. The language must be there. But it is the soul which matters. The language changes, has changed, will change; is never more than suggestive: discloses at its first word and its last its own ingrained insufficiency; must be mended in its expression from one generation to another, that it may not fall too far short of its necessary, verbal endeavour. The language, though requisite, is light and secondary. It is the soul which matters. I believe in the soul of the Church of England; it is the Holy Ghost within those limits; I have been born again of it; all that is best in me is akin to it; my real self belongs to it and it is intrinsically mine. At the root of things it is this, not dogmatic technique and propriety, which makes a Churchman.¹

The author of these words is a leading English Modernist, a fearless protagonist as much for Christian simplicity of life in an age of self-indulgence and mammon-worship as for intellectual freedom and progress. He it was who edited *A Declaration of*

¹ *Theological Room*, by Hubert Handley, pp. 126-128.

Biblical Criticism by 1725 Clergy of the Anglican Communion, in 1906, having some five years earlier published his book with its Tacitean title, *The Fatal Opulence of Bishops*.

There is one attitude towards the creeds which the Modernist cannot adopt or advise, and that is silence. The argument for silence, or, as some would call it, reserve, has strong support from those who would protect the sacred simplicity of the uneducated believer.

Leave to thy sister when she prays
Her simple faith and early views,
Nor thou with shadowed thought confuse
The life that leads harmonious days.

It is quite right not to intrude such matters on our sister at her prayers, but it is different when our sister is in the class-room. An educational policy, which has such a reverence for the intellectual weakness of infants that it declines to give teaching to adults, experiences a terrible nemesis; a policy of caution which keeps silence until probabilities are certainties, is bound to suffer from obscurantism and loss of moral vigour. It is right to give milk to babes, but the place for babes is the nursery and not the congregation of those who have put away childish things. The Christian Church, although it admits infants and can give them appropriate instruction, is in its ideal the society of the Sons and Daughters of God and the motto of its curriculum is "From strength to strength." "Howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men."

In such a curriculum reserve or silence on the part of the teacher who is pressed by questions is immoral. The teacher does well to remember that pupils have little interest in the answer to a question until they have themselves asked it; but they ought not to be discouraged from asking questions, but rather taught, as Francis Bacon points out, that a wise question is half its own answer. But above all the Christian teacher must absolutely shun the temptations of *suppressio veri* or *suggestio falsi*. There must be unflinching truthfulness, even though the immediate good results of such truthfulness are not manifest. Jesus Christ was not eager to declare His Messianism. Modern criticism of the Gospels shows how careful He was to prepare the way for that declaration. But when the direct question was put to Him by the High Priest, and He knew that His affirmative reply would incur the sentence of death, He did not hesitate to give it. If, as the Modernist advocates, the liturgical use of the ancient historic creeds be retained in the Church of to-day, it can be done without absolute disaster in the face of obscurantist Traditionalism only if it be combined with fearless, outspoken truth-telling on the part of the Christian teacher. Let him combine chivalry with caution and courage. Moreover, let the Church authorities realize that, if they are going to retain a fixed liturgy, the modern situation demands that this must be combined with a free pulpit.

XIII

THE MODERNIST'S TASK AND HIS ALLIES

A growing Faith and an evolving Theology.

— BISHOP BOYD CARPENTER.

Thou hast great allies;
Thy friends are exultations, agonies,
And love, and *man's unconquerable mind*.

— WORDSWORTH.

IN its broad outline the task of the English Modernist is two-fold. His is a *certamen anceps* — a battle fought on two fronts at once — like that of David against the Syrians and Ammonites.¹ There is on the one hand the Modernist's apologetic defence of the Christian Religion against the Secularist and Materialist. This is often forgotten or ignored by Traditionalists, who assume that the Modernists are concerned only with destroying the foundations of the Christian faith and in taking sides with its enemies. Yet it needs no very intimate acquaintance with English religious literature of the last thirty years to recognize what a valuable contribution has been made by English Liberals and Modernists to Christian apologetics.² I think that it is

¹ II *Sam.*, x. 9 f.

² E. g., Dean Hastings Rashdall, Bishops Boyd Carpenter and Hensley Henson, Dean W. H. Fremantle, Canon Barnett, Dean Inge, Canon Sanday, Canon J. M. Wilson, Professor C. C. J. Webb, A.

no exaggeration to say that their writings will be found, when taken as a whole, to outweigh in influence and quality the apologetic contributions of contemporary traditionalists in the English Church.

One would suppose *a priori* that the Secularist and Materialist would be friendly to the Modernist, because it might be reasoned that what Secularists and Materialists are opposed to is not the Christian Religion but the obscurantist, superstitious, and intolerant elements in Christianity; and that, if they could only find Christians who were as much opposed to these things as are the Secularists and Materialists themselves, and were resolved to rid Christianity of them, they would join hands with the Modernists, or, if that seemed impossible, at least sympathize with them. This, however, is unfortunately a conclusion which cannot be sustained in a number of cases. The Secularists and Materialists have apparently made up their minds that Chris-

Clutton-Brock, Lily Dougall, Professor Percy Gardner, Professor Gwatkin, Professor Caldecott, Canon Streeter, Professor Nairne, Dr. Coulton, Professor F. B. Jevons, Canon Vernon Storr, Alice Gardner, Maude Royden, Professors Bethune-Baker, W. R. Matthews, Foakes-Jackson, G. W. Wade, Kirsopp Lake, and Widgery; Canons Gamble, Danks, E. S. Woods, Glazebrook, Raven, Adderley, and H. A. Wilson; Doctors Winstanley, Latimer Jackson, A. J. Carlyle, Geikie Cobb, Bouquet, and Skrine; the Reverends J. R. Cohu, Maurice Pryke, E. A. Edghill, A. W. Hutton, J. C. Hardwick, C. F. Russell, Harold Anson, C. W. Emmet, Hubert Handley, F. A. M. Spencer, J. M. Thompson, E. C. Dewick, C. H. S. Matthews, C. J. Shebbeare, and J. R. Wilkinson; Archdeacons R. H. Charles and Lilley; Bishop Mercer; and Dean Hewlett Johnson — all, with very few exceptions, members of our English Modernist society, the Churchmen's Union for the Advancement of Liberal Religious Thought (founded in 1898; office at the Church House, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S. W. 1).

tianity is essentially obscurantist, superstitious, and intolerant, and that to strive to rid it of these ingrained vices and to present it to the world as enlightened, progressive, and tolerant, is to misrepresent it; and, furthermore, that those who attempt to do this are playing a hypocritical game — they are really the subtlest of Jesuits. The Secularists and Materialists have also made up their minds that there is no place for religion in life; that religion is mere moonshine and magic, or something worse; that it is a subtle poison which enfeebles the human understanding and corrupts the natural instincts; or, if the metaphor be changed, that it is a pestilential miasma which the beams of the rising sun of science must disperse for ever. For them as they read the history of religion it has but three stages: polytheism, monotheism, atheism. They look into the future with the eyes of J. M. Guyau,¹ and they see written across it "Non-Religion" — and they are glad. They greet the Modernist programme in the way in which Bunyan's Atheist greeted the narration of the object of the pilgrim's quest. Bunyan writes: "Then Atheist fell into a very great laughter." The laughter is not good-humoured, it is prompted by surprise, antipathy, and contempt. The Modernist, however, is not surprised at it. The history of the Christian Religion, although not so black as Madame Blavatsky's *Black Book* represented it, is full of terrible blots: its inquisitions, its persecutions, its religious wars, its ferocious intolerance, its blind obscurantism, its unconscious hypo-

¹ Author of *The Non-Religion of the Future*.

crisy. A Lucretius could exclaim against pre-Christian religion: *Tantum relligio potuit suadere malorum*,—"How many are the evil things to which religion is able to persuade men,"—but the Christian Religion seems to the modern Secularist to have even less to its credit than the Pagan religions condemned by Lucretius, for certain of its most notable adherents deliberately rejected the noblest philosophies of the Græco-Roman civilization to embrace it, and by embracing it, brought about, so the greatest historian of the Roman Empire would have us believe, its decline and fall, with what disastrous results:

Thou hast conquered, O pale Galilæan!
And the world has turned chill at thy breath.

But there are not only Christianity's past sins, there is also Christianity's present menace. Nietzsche pointed to its slave morality which appeals to the cowardly, inert, and contemptible. It is a religion which counteracts biological evolution in that very thing in which biological evolution seems most commendable,—its efforts to promote the survival of the fittest,—and so Christianity by its doctrine of passivity tends to retard that progress which ensues from the elimination of the unfit. The Gospel of Jesus, it is contended, seeks to protect and to save the unfit, and so it weighs down its Christian civilization, so-called, with the burden of this growing parasitical element. It threatens thereby to turn the world not into a place for heroes to live in, but into a vast almshouse, infirmary, and lunatic asylum

combined. A scientific creed and a scientific system of ethics, so the Secularist contends, would quickly end all this and give us a eugenic population and a noble civilization, but Christianity, the most formidable of the religions, — formidable not least because of its Protean adaptability, — blocks the road to progress. The Christian Religion is preëminently the opiate of the people. The Secularist longs to awaken the proletariat from its "doped" slumbers, but the Traditionalists most obstinately and resolutely drown his trumpet-blasts with chants and hymns; and as for the Modernist, he would cunningly try to steal the science of the Secularist and harness it to the triumphal car of Christ. This is the deadliest attempt on Secularism with which it has yet been faced; and if it were to succeed, it might well mean the triumph of the Religion of Jesus in human history, and as a consequence a world-wide civilization based upon it.

The Modernist replies to these attacks by pointing out, first, that it is not the "Truth as it is in Jesus," to use a Pauline phrase, which is responsible for the atrocities of Church History, but those passions in human nature which the Spirit of Christ would tame and transmute. Secondly, that the charge against Christian ethics may be met by pointing out that Christianity does not acquiesce in vice: its aim is to redeem and ennoble character; it seeks to win the slaves of sin from their sin, not to protect them in it, and its method of approach is with a message of hope and forgiveness, of love and life — and psychologically this can be shown to be the

most effective of methods. Thirdly, the type of virtue it inculcates is not individualist like that of the Stoics, but social. Hence it stresses these qualities of humility, patience, gentleness, meekness, self-sacrificing love, which possess a high social value. Although these qualities — which roused the indignation of Nietzsche — seem to lead to the effacement of the individual, yet on the other hand they do constitute an excellent social cement and tend to the creation of a fellowship in which active love reigns supreme and all service is voluntary and honourable. In this fellowship those who rule (for some must needs do so) claim no superiority over the rest, for it is the privilege of all to serve. Unless humanity is to abandon the democratic ideal of government of the people, by the people, for the people, the Christian ethic must assume a steadily increasing importance in enabling humanity to realize a true and beneficial democracy. In short, without the Christian ethic the attainment of true democracy is impossible. Fourthly, the reply to those who charge Christianity with a Protean adaptability is that the charge is true. It is this adaptability which has enabled Christianity not only to survive but to triumph. This adaptability is due to Christianity's peculiar character: that it is a religion of the Spirit not of the letter. There is nothing immoral in changing if change be in accordance with principles and not merely opportunist. It was J. H. Newman who said: "To live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often." All the changes urged by the Modernist can be shown to be in harmony with the fundamental principles of the Christian Religion.

In making this defence against the Secularist, the Modernist is well aware that Christianity is not a demonstrable certainty, but a great experiment, a venture of faith, a working hypothesis. There is no other way of proving it to be either true or false but by trying it; experience affords a sounder test than logic, especially than that kind of logic which is called in the English universities "the remorseless logic of the undergraduate." As Dr. J. R. Illingworth put it: "The Christian Religion refuses to be proved first and practised afterwards: its practice and its proof go hand in hand."

At the same time there seems to be a good deal more to be said in favour of the Religion of Jesus to-day than there was 2,000 years ago. The "either — or" form of statement is to be avoided, yet it would seem as though humanity is to-day being forced to choose either Christ or Chaos.

To achieve in human society as a whole the practice of the ethic of Jesus may seem far beyond the bounds of possibility, yet to reject that ethic deliberately and to adopt that of Nietzsche or some other secularist system threatens stagnation or disaster to the human race.

The ethic of Jesus leads into no *cul-de-sac*: it is in harmony with evolution; it leaves the road open to infinite moral progress; just because it seems unattainable, it is to be preferred to the more easily practised ethic of a rationalistic utilitarianism.

So much for the Christian ethic; what about the Christian Religion with which it is indissolubly linked? Anthropology and the Science of Compara-

tive Religion are, the Modernist points out, against the Secularist. They show mankind, in Auguste Sabatier's phrase, to be "incurably religious." They prove that religion is an essential factor in the life of every evolving society. They teach that a community with a moribund religion is in imminent danger of decay and dissolution. Moreover, religion is shown to be subject to evolution as is every other human institution. Magic, animism, totemism, fetichism, polydæmonism, henotheism, polytheism, have been necessary stages in that evolution. This evolution has been in response to man's steadily evolving needs; so magic has yielded to spiritual religion; spell has become prayer; animal sacrifice has been replaced by the offering of the will of man to the will of God.

Our wills are ours we know not how
Our wills are ours to make them Thine.

As we study the long history of humanity, there is no indication that religion is dying, but there is overwhelming proof that it is being rationalized and moralized and spiritualized. Every civilization in its deepest and most abiding aspects is seen to be a reflection of its religion, for religion is the inner side of civilization. There are certain assured results of these modern studies of religion to which the Modernist would direct the attention of the Secularist. The first is that you cannot have a vital and progressive civilization without a religion; secondly, only the higher religions — the *founded* religions — will be in existence a few decades hence; thirdly, the

Christian Religion — by which we mean not traditional Christianity, but the Religion of Jesus as enshrined in the Lord's Prayer, the Beatitudes, the Two Commandments, the Parable of the Prodigal Son, and, above all, in the Personality and Spirit of Him who in absolute devotion to the Divine Will surrendered His life to advance the Kingdom of God — is the highest form which the evolution of religion has attained, and it gives, we may add, no indication whatever of being transcended. Our students of religion have shown that Christianity has much in common with the other religions of mankind, but it also has that which is unique.

The Science of Religion has demonstrated that as "the treasure and the mystery of the Religion of Israel is its prophetism," so the treasure and the mystery of the Christian Religion is Jesus Christ and His Gospel of the Kingdom. Primitive Christianity was not wrong when in the very centre of the framework of Jewish eschatology it placed Jesus Christ seated on the judgment-throne and beheld Him as God's Viceregent judging mankind in accordance with the principles of His Gospel. "When saw we Thee anhungered or athirst, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, or in prison, and ministered unto Thee? And He shall say: Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren ye did it unto Me."

In the fight on the anti-Secularist front the English Modernist has powerful allies. They constitute three battalions. There is the battalion of idealist philosophers, which includes such writers in Great

Britain as the two Cairds, Andrew Fairbairn, Professors James Ward and W. R. Sorley, F. H. Bradley, Bernard Bosanquet, and Pringle-Pattison, Sir Henry Jones and John Theodore Merz, C. C. J. Webb and W. R. Matthews, A. E. Taylor and William Temple, Lord Balfour, and Lord Haldane, and on the continent Bergson and Eucken, Höffding and Otto, Croce and Gentile, and, last but not least, the American Josiah Royce. These and many others have demonstrated the inadequacy of the materialistic interpretation of the Universe and have rendered a spiritual interpretation of it both possible and necessary.

Then there is the battalion of British poets. There are many in our population to whom the Church's creeds and sectarian shibboleths have ceased to make any appeal who are yet inspired by the poetry of the nineteenth century. William Wordsworth and S. T. Coleridge, Alfred Tennyson and Robert Browning, William Blake and John Keble, Matthew Arnold and Arthur Clough, George MacDonald and Francis Thompson, Robert Louis Stevenson, Sir Henry Newbolt, Rudyard Kipling,¹ John Masefield, and many others, have exercised a wide and deep religious influence, and one which constitutes an important element in English education to-day. Certainly the English Materialists and Secularists seem to be unable to produce poetry of a high order; and so almost the only English poets that count are on the side of the angels.

¹ "The Recessional" and "If."

The third battalion is composed of scientists. There have been not a few English scientists, who, while standing firmly for the truth and authority of science, have also taken particular pains to show that those who draw from scientific discoveries conclusions which are hostile to morality and spiritual religion, and teach that man must be estimated in the light of his brute ancestry or expressed in terms of a mechanistic science, are, from the scientific point of view, without justification. T. H. Huxley, in his Romanes Lectures, Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir Alfred Wallace, Lord Kelvin, Professors John Haldane, Lloyd Morgan, Silvanus Thompson, F. Soddy, W. McDougall, J. Arthur Thomson, and a number of others have done more by their writings to impress the non-church-going British public with the conviction that Science, when properly understood, is not hostile either to Christian morality or to the spiritual interpretation of the Universe than have the official teachers of religion and morality. Science, though it has done much and promises to do a great deal more, cannot of itself provide a religion which could take the place of Christianity. As Bishop Boyd Carpenter, one of the most illustrious of my predecessors in this Lectureship, truly and felicitously said in his Bampton Lectures:

The defect of the scientific creed is that it supplies no ideal. There are excellent precepts, there are strong reasonings, there are stern enforcements, but there is no ideal. Its power of looking forward is bounded by its power of looking backward, and its backward glance is limited by the range of knowledge. . . . The ideal city,

like the ideal man, descends out of Heaven, from God. What then do we see? The religion of the future; and the religion of the future based upon personality: upon personality in man, and upon that personality in God, which is above all personality.

It is with this question of the religion of the future in its relation to Modernism that I propose to deal in my next section.

XIV

MODERNISM AND THE FUTURE

It is characteristic of such an unphilosophical race as the English to hold on firmly to Christianity; they *need* its discipline for moralising and humanising. — NIETZSCHE.

Modernism, of course, will vanish when its work is done. In fact it must die to live, for it does not seek to create a new branch of the Christian Church, but to enter into and enrich all existing communions. — Bishop BARNES of Birmingham.

Perhaps every age needs to reject the Christianity of the past so that it may discover Christianity for itself. — CLUTTON BROCK.

HAL. The *next* religion? Before we've worked out the last? What have you found more beautiful or uplifting than the words of Christ? And this religion has the advantage of being already organised — it carries the inspiration and consecration of the centuries.

STEPHEN. And their encrustation of error! And their petrifications!

HAL. Then vivify it, scour it, bring it back to the Founder. Perhaps Christ's own religion has never had a chance — perhaps *that's* the next religion.

— ISRAEL ZANGWILL.

WHAT of the future of English Modernism? It is, of course, gratuitous to indulge in prediction, yet it is most natural to ask the question. Prudence dictates the question, even though it be hope rather than wisdom which answers it. I would preface my answer by saying that now that apocalyptic expectations of a speedy terminus to human history have been dissipated, it is incumbent on the Church's

leaders to take longer views of the future than their predecessors took. Those suffer in this matter from mental fetters who think of the Church as very old and themselves as the guardians of this immemorial antiquity. This is no new obsession. Even in the second century, Hermas, the author of *The Pastor*, represented the Church as an old woman. One of the most erudite of our English prelates, Bishop John Wordsworth of Salisbury, who from his immense knowledge of Christian antiquity might well have fallen a victim to this delusion of the oldness of the Christian Church, warned his contemporaries against it. He wrote in his *Ministry of Grace*:

It is a natural and unconscious prejudice — but still it is a prejudice — that the past is longer and more important than the future. . . . The future looks short before us unless we make a very serious effort to overcome the prepossession. And if we make an effort by what is called building castles in the air or imagining great developments, reason checks us and bids us be practical. . . . But for all that, it is a duty to remind ourselves from time to time that there is a future for the Church, possibly on this earth (I should say probably) and certainly in the ages of eternity, which will be infinitely larger and broader in its scope than the past with all its glory has been.

If only our Church Authorities can realize that the Christian Church is young, — and it is interesting to observe that in the *Book of the Revelation* she is represented as young: "The Spirit and the Bride say, Come," — and that she is, as her history demonstrates, capable of adaptation theologically, they

ought to be able to overcome the ageing influence of Traditionalism, which is rendering the Church decrepit. If they cannot do this, the Church as a world-influence is doomed. "Christianity is at the Cross-Roads," or rather part of Christianity is there — the English Church. Will the English Church take the wrong turning? In the light of its history I can hardly think that it will. A section may, but the whole will not. If it does, then not only will a deadly blow have been struck at organized historic Christianity, but even at Christianity itself. Yet the world cannot do without the Christian Religion — that is the primary conviction of the English Modernist; and the Christian Religion cannot do without the Church — that is his second conviction; and his third conviction is that the Church cannot do without the Spirit of Modernism, that spirit which is ever renewing and adapting that in our religion which from oldness is ready to vanish away. Many reasons have been adduced for the triumph of Christianity over its rivals in the Roman Empire in the first three centuries of its history. There are Gibbon's five reasons; there are Harnack's;¹ there are Loisy's; there are Glover's;² there were five reasons given by my late friend and colleague C. W. Emmet, *viz.*³

(1) An extraordinarily high, simple, and attractive doctrine of God.

¹ *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity.*

² *The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire.*

³ Article in the *Modern Churchman*, xii, 316-326.

(2) A totally new conception of man and his value to God.

(3) A clear statement of the relation of God to the material world.

(4) A salvation not merely of individuals but of human society as a whole.

(5) An outlook which is full of hope.

English Modernism conflicts with none of these five reasons — in fact it puts them in the foreground of its programme — and not least in bidding men to look forward, not backward, for the justification of the Christian Religion. Modernism strives to show, as Canon J. M. Wilson has stated in his latest published essay, that to be a wholehearted evolutionist is, in a word, not inconsistent with either the habits or the hopes of the Christian religion. For example, it is not inconsistent with prayer, and worship, with the effort so to study the Bible as to think of God and man more and more as Christ thought of them, and to act accordingly; nor is it inconsistent with widely diverse intellectual and spiritual temperaments.¹

Traditionalist Christianity needs to grasp that fact, and the non-Christian world needs to grasp it also. Modernism, if successful, will not only accomplish what the late T. H. Huxley declared to be a most important task, — “an especial duty of this generation,” — “To work towards a synthesis of science and faith . . . a synthesis in the establishment of reasonable beliefs founded on the whole of

¹ *Evolution in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (1925), p. 512.

our knowledge of nature, human and non-human"; it will not only heal, what Dean Inge described as, that "open sore which poisons the spiritual life of the civilized world,"¹—the conflict between science and religion, — but it will go far to achieve Christian Reunion. That union can be accomplished permanently, not by diplomatic arrangements between separated denominations, but only by unity of thought and sentiment, and that unity of thought has to be of such a kind as not to fetter the intellect and "bang, bar, and bolt the door" against theological development — that is why many English Modernists have no desire for organic union at present with Christian bodies which do not recognize these principles, although they would welcome inter-communion and coöperation with them. The Spirit of Modernism promises, as it permeates all Christian bodies, a reunion of Christendom on these free and progressive and enduring lines.

It is urged by the opponents of Modernism that Modernism can have no future because it is purely intellectualist and has an interest only for a few academic persons and even for very few of them. It has, it is maintained, no significance or value for the vast dim common populations. This is a half-truth. They have little interest in Modernism, but it has great import for them. Father Woodlock, the chief of our English Jesuit controversialists, recently said in my hearing, when presenting the Traditionalist case against Modernism: "I may be an old-fashioned person, but there are a great number

¹ *Modern Churchman*, xiv, 218.

of old-fashioned persons in this world." That is very true, but the point is that they are very rapidly diminishing as the result of modern education; and so, as the old-fashioned are being replaced by the new-fashioned, Modernism may perchance gain a wider and wider audience; but whether it does or not, Traditionalism is bound to have a steadily diminishing body of adherents as the years pass and the standard of education rises. My friend, the late Maurice Pryke, in his recent book *Modernism as a Working Faith*,¹ has shown that fifteen years of English parochial experience proves not only the increasing need for Modernist Christian teaching among English industrial and rural populations, but that the Modernist Churchman gains audience and wins conviction by such teaching.

Moreover, there is the service which Modernism can render to Christianity in the Mission Field. Dean Rashdall wrote some years ago in a paper entitled "The Motive of Modern Missionary Work": "It is much to be desired that things which educated men are ceasing to believe at home should no longer be taught to the heathen abroad." What the Dean desired is steadily being realized. I find that there are an increasing number of missionaries who are becoming Modernist. As a recent Fundamentalist document declared with regard to the Protestant educational missions in China, "Modernism has got a strangle-hold on the Mission field in this land." The Modernism of Anglican missionaries is not openly declared in most cases, because the lead-

¹ Heffers', Cambridge, 1925.

ing members of the missionary societies at home, whose servants they are, are much less Modernist than their missionaries, and would be alarmed if they knew that their missionaries are Modernists. Nevertheless, the growth of Modernism in the foreign missions worked by Anglican missionaries is very notable. There are many good reasons for this, not the least of them being — as Professor Caldecott indicated in a paper contributed by him to the Sixth Conference of Modern Churchmen¹ — the great advantages which the Modernist enjoys over the Traditionalist missionary. The first advantage which Dr. Caldecott selects is that the Modernist missionary seeks to win converts, not to the acceptance of a number of ancient traditional beliefs, but first and foremost to share in a present spiritual experience, to enter into new Divine relations, to walk in newness of life. “We do not,” says Dr. Caldecott, “ask men of other religions to go back to a remote and localized past manifestation: for us the Pentecostal outpouring continues now.”

Another advantage which Modernism provides is found in the simplification of the Christian appeal. Of this Dr. Caldecott writes:

We enjoy the benefit of long continued scrutiny as to which elements are Universal and which are Particular in religion. On the one hand, we discriminate and mark off features that are local, temporary, national. We can see, for example, how such complexes have arisen as the expiatory and penal doctrines of Atonement: Verbal Inspiration: limitation of spiritual credentials to official

¹ *Modern Churchman*, ix, 174 f.

Ministries, sometimes even with materialistic elements regarded as essential: the web of Greek metaphysical concepts, and the later complications of it in Scholasticism. The unravelling of the Gospel from these entanglements places the modern Church, surely, in a different position as to expansibility from the Church of our immediate predecessors encumbered with the thousands of dogmata included in, say, Pearson *On the Creed*, or with the *Book of Common Prayer* regarded as the only possible liturgy for all nations and all times.

And on the other hand we can see the opposite error by which simplification has been carried to excess. For example, the depersonalization of the Gospel by Harnack into three fundamentals which belong as much to philosophy as to religion: or the Rationalism of Hegelian philosophers: or the abstract and unorganized forms of Mystical faith. Or in another direction the reduction of Christianity to the Apocalyptic element which was one of its original features.

Our simplification extends to Church order as well as to Church doctrine. We avoid alike thinking of the expansion of Christianity as the extension of a single complicated and highly concentrated Church under one visible head as the Church of Rome does, or as proceeding by means of an unordered individualistic piety as in the China Inland Mission. We think of a real and effective Church, but simplified, plastic, and capable of variety and adaptation.

It was really no unaccountable accident that the Kikuyu incident in East Africa ended in a violent anti-Modernist campaign in England, for where the Church is most in action, there the Modernist issues will be bound to arise. Efficiency, whether abroad

or at home, demands a Modernist handling of traditional doctrines, rites, and organization.

Another advantage that the Modernist missionary possesses is found in his attitude toward other religions: they are in his eyes preparatory to Christianity, and although inferior, are not essentially alien. Christianity does not so much strive to replace them as it seeks to perfect them.

These and other considerations lead us to conclude that, whatever may be the future of Modernism in the Church in England, at least it has a great and growing future in the Foreign Mission field, especially in the East.

Christianity in a Modernist form may find, it is conceded, a place for a season in the Mission field, but Modernism is not going to enable Christianity to regain its hold on our Western civilization. This seems certainly to be the conviction of Professor Loisy, and, although not a conviction in the case of Professor Lake, it seems to him to be a serious possibility and to prompt the question as to whether Modernism has not come too late. When it is urged that Modernism has arrived too late, it is really meant that Christian theology has no longer any living interest for modern communities; that the Christian Church is really a back number; that whether it has a theology which is not in conflict with modern thought or a theology which is in conflict with modern thought, does not trouble anyone except a few academic theologians who will have no successors; organized Christianity, with its institutions, rites, liturgies, creeds, has reached the last

stage of its existence: less than a century will see its disappearance save among a few dwindling communities of obscurantists; Christianity's reign as an organized religion is nearly finished: the Spirit of Christ, set free from the cramping fetters of ecclesiasticism, will pass into modern civilization and exercise nobler and better effects there than it has achieved within the bounds of ecclesiastical bodies.

As a Modernist I cannot accept that view. Religion I regard as a needful and permanent factor in all vital and progressive communities; and the Christian Religion demands the Christian Church as the organ of its survival and influence; what we require is to reform the Christian Church, not disintegrate and dissipate it. If we do not get our religion right, our civilization will collapse. I venture to remind you of a saying of Frederic Harrison, the leader of English Positivism:

All our mighty achievements are being hampered and often neutralized . . . all our social diseases are being aggravated by this supreme and dominant fact — that we have suffered our religion to slide from us. . . . The urgent task of our time is to recover a religious faith as a basis of life, both personal and social.

Religion must in the modern state have a body as well as a spirit, an organization as well as an ideal; the Christian Religion, I am convinced, embodies potentially the highest form of religious evolution, and is, moreover, an essential factor in that type of civilization which the most thoughtful and most morally sensitive people in our Western world desire

to realize. It is then on account of the immense service which the Christian Religion can render to mankind, and which it can render only as an organization, that I am led to believe that the Christian Religion will survive, and that the Christian Church in some form will survive also. Pessimistic estimates of the power of the Christian Church to survive are no novelty. Even Bishop Butler doubted if the Church of England could survive for another generation; and Voltaire boasted that what twelve men had founded, one man had destroyed. If the Christian Church be dying, then like Charles II it is an unconscionable time about it; but I do not believe that it really is dying. Its history proves its extraordinary vitality. Yet on the other hand, I do not see how in our Western communities, with their rising standards of education, traditional Christianity can be anything else but a declining influence in shaping the world of the future, unless it be modernized. Everyone who thinks about it, who is not a Traditionalist, is convinced of this. I would cite but three writers — an American, an Englishman, and a Dane — as witnesses.

These are the words of William James:

The theological machinery, that spoke so livingly to our ancestors, with its finite age of the world, its creation out of nothing, its juridical morality and eschatology, its relish for rewards and punishments, its treatment of God as an external contriver, sounds as odd to most of us as if it were some out-landish rude religion.

These are the words of Alfred Fawkes:

It is not so much that traditionalism has been disproved — I do not know that witchcraft or that astrology has been disproved — or that it is no longer accepted by persons of education: it is rather that the mental climate has changed to such an extent that it is impossible that the traditional position should now be held.

These are the words of Harald Höffding:

Religion was once the pillar of fire which went before the human race in its great march through history, showing it the way. Now, alas, it is fast assuming the rôle of the ambulance which follows in the rear and picks up the exhausted and wounded. This, indeed, is a great work, but it is not sufficient. And when religion has disburdened itself of all its dead values, it will once more, in ultimate association with ethics, rise to be a power which leads men onwards.

I believe all the reformed communions are realizing this in some measure. It is not, however, so clear that they are realizing that increased social sympathy, multiplied philanthropic activities, a zeal for world-wide disarmament and international peace, cannot avail to restore the influence of the Christian Religion unless it has the courage to reform its theology. In this connection, I am well aware that I have said nothing that many have not said in Christendom for the last two generations. One who is usually regarded as a political reformer not as a theologian, but who saw as clearly as his great country-man, Cicero, the fundamental relation be-

tween religion and national welfare, — I mean Mazzini, — outlined the issues between Traditionalism and Modernism in a passage worth recalling:

(1) Your definition of life is the doctrine of original sin; ours asserts the imperfection of the finite creature, and its gradual self-correction through faith in a divine ideal which each is bound to incarnate in himself. (2) You believe in *miracles*; in the supernatural; in the possible violation of the laws regulating the universe; we believe in the unknown, the mysterious (to be one day solved), which now encompasses us on every side. (3) You believe in a God who has created and reposes; we believe in a continuity of creation. (4) You believe in a heaven extrinsic to the universe; we believe in *one Heaven*, in which we live and move and love: which embraces (as an ocean the islands that stud its surface) the whole indefinite series of existence; we believe in the transformation of the body (which is naught else but an instrument adapted to the work to be achieved) in conformity with the progress of the *Ego*. . . . (6) All things are, in your creed, definite, limited, immediate, bearing the stamp of a certain immobility, which recalls the characteristics of the materialist conception of life. In our creed all is life, movement, succession and continuity. (7) Your dogma humanized God; our dogma teaches the slow, progressive *divinization* of man.

As far as I can judge, I do not think that Modernism has come too late to save the situation among the English-speaking peoples. The indifference to Christianity among English people is much more apparent than real. I have not found among Englishmen, still less among Scotchmen, when I really knew them, that indifference to the Christian Re-

ligion which their attitude to religious practices might suggest. There are, notwithstanding the many disappointments and set-backs they have experienced, large numbers who, while they feel themselves to be sheep without a shepherd, are yet united in desiring sincerity, reality, simplicity in Christian Faith and Worship. When they put aside their natural reticence their attitude is not one of denial and rejection but of sympathetic enquiry: "Tell us," they say, "what you really believe about the great questions. Surely you cannot hold the old beliefs: if you do you are greater fools than we take you for. Cannot you help us to a faith which is credible, and reasonable, a faith which has nothing to fear from new discoveries, a religion which can really claim our whole-hearted loyalty? We wish if possible to possess such." These men are all potential Modernists and they are also potential Agnostics; what they are not, is potential Traditionalists: they have passed that turning and can never retrace their steps. If Modernist teaching can win these men, and I believe it can win many of them, the future of English Modernism must be an advance from strength to strength.

Modernism offers three great advantages over Traditionalism which are as much in harmony with essential Christianity as with the modern mind.

First, Modernism satisfies the modern Christian's intellect by giving him freedom of research.

Secondly, Modernism satisfies the modern Christian's conscience by giving him freedom to teach the truth as he learns it.

Thirdly, Modernism satisfies the modern Christian's heart by admitting to Christian fellowship all who call Jesus Lord.

That English Modernism has great prospects of ultimate success is as much the opinion of its opponents as of its supporters. I cite two opinions of bitter opponents. The opinions are over four years old, but from the Traditionalist point of view the position has not changed for the better since they were uttered. Dr. Charles Harris, who has written a book against English Modernism,¹ said in addressing the annual gathering of the English Church Union at Oxford, in June, 1921:

We are living in dark and dangerous days. The Modernist movement, small as it is numerically, is so much in harmony with certain dangerous modern tendencies that it is capable of doing infinite harm. Working like a hidden leaven underground, it is shaking the faith of multitudes in all revealed truth, and, indeed, in all truth. It suggests that all human beliefs are in a continual state of flux, and that it is impossible to formulate any statements about God, or about man, or about morality, which are permanently and unalterably true. It substitutes for the "deposit of faith," entrusted by Christ to His Church to be faithfully guarded, the idea of a continual flux and change of doctrine, uncontrolled by the teaching of Christ and His Apostles.

I need hardly add that this curiously misrepresents English Modernism in a number of particulars. For instance, there is, from the Modernist point of view, both a changing and an unchanging element in

¹ *Creeds or No Creeds* (1922), published by John Murray.

Christian theology and Christian ethics. So far as I know, there is no English Modernist who would not regard as unalterably true such statements as "God is Love"; "God is Light"; "God is Truth"; "God is Spirit"; or such commands as "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself"; or such affirmations as "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself"; "All things work together for good to them that love God"; "Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not obey the lusts of the flesh"; "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His"; "Beloved, now are we children of God"; "If we walk in the Light as He is in the Light, we have fellowship one with another"; "If we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." It would be possible greatly to increase this list of unalterable or permanent Christian affirmations.

The other citation is from an article contributed to the *Dublin Review* in June, 1921, by the Reverend R. A. Wynter, who left the English Church to enter the Roman Church, but has since returned. He writes:

Until the last five years or so it appeared as if the Catholic party, having vanquished its active opponents . . . had only to leaven the inert mass (p. 267).

More dangerous and subtle antagonists than the ignorant Protestantism it has hitherto had to encounter, dispute the field, and will, I believe, ultimately lead to its disruption (p. 268).

Nothing of late years has approached in significance the rapid growth of Modernism. At first confined to the

studies of a few University professors, tentatively propagated in books that reached only a narrow academic circle and caused merely the ridicule of the High Church Churchman, it now issues an ever-increasing flood of literature, and is fearlessly propagated (p. 268).

The Modernists now include bishops, deans, canons, professors, teachers of theological students, and numbers of the parochial clergy.

You think that your party is getting the upper hand, and that you are with the flowing tide. But the truth is, it is all the other way. It is the Modernists and their ways of thinking that are getting hold of the Church. You are fiddling, while it is burning.

Modernism, and the spirit of Modernism, is rapidly capturing the Church of England (p. 273).

No doubt the Modernist advance would be easier within the Church of England if there were not such a large number of educated Englishmen who despair of the Church of England. It is only practising members of a communion that can effectively reform it, because they alone can reform it constitutionally. Those who separate themselves from its organized life and activities, and criticize and condemn it from the outside, can do little to assist reform. Indeed, their criticisms are regarded as a form of destructive hostility, and strengthen the hands of the anti-Modernists. One of the hardest tasks of the English Modernists is to persuade disgruntled and despairing Anglicans not to desert the ship, even though they feel sure she is heading for the rocks, but to stay on board and try to win their fellow sailors to help them in altering the ship's course.

Another barrier to the Modernist advance is the ecclesiastical press, and those portions of the secular press in England which are controlled by ecclesiastical interests. By repeated attacks, which make use of gross misrepresentations, alarm and horror are created in the minds of devout Traditionalists, and even the general reader gains the impression that the Modernist is an enemy of Christianity instead of a friend. Modernism does not aim at producing a new religion. Its religion is the Christian Religion—the Religion of Jesus. It is not even primarily concerned with producing a new theology, for it is not primarily speculative but practical. Its aim is not to produce a theology, but to mould an institution, so that that institution may be of increased value for the modern man, not simply as an individual, but as a member of a social and political organism.

The only way to meet public misrepresentation is by public teaching, and Modernists by their books, pamphlets, magazine articles, public conferences, and so on, are steadily engaged in doing that, although at present they command little in the way of material resources compared with their opponents, whether Anglican, Roman, or Protestant. And I think it only just to add here that the language of the English Modernists has been remarkable for reverence, caution, and restraint. Indeed, they have developed those qualities to such a degree in a number of cases that they have deprived their teaching of that note of popularity and dramatic interest which is certainly necessary to win the

multitude. However, it is a fault on the right side. A movement in its early stages has more to fear from its enthusiastic and injudicious friends than from its enemies.

Another serious barrier to Modernist advance is the rigorously Traditionalist training given to the large majority of the English clergy in their theological colleges. A Modernist laity becomes impossible without a Modernist clergy — by a Modernist laity I mean of course a body of Modernist practising Church-members. Very few of the more intellectually alert laity seem able to endure the prolonged intellectual and moral martyrdom which they suffer from an obscurantist clergy, and in the end the great majority cease to take any part in English Church life. Here again criticism, however just and well-directed, avails but little in comparison with action. If Modernist laity desire a Modernist clergy, they must provide for their training. Already some of the Modernist laity see this, and Modernist theological colleges are beginning to get to work. At present I should say that not ten *per cent* of those ordained are Modernists; indeed I doubt if five *per cent* are; but the work is still in its early stages. So far most of the money contributed for this undertaking has been supplied by the Modernist clergy, led by my predecessor in these Lectures — Bishop Boyd Carpenter. It seems to me that the whole future of the English Modernist campaign turns on this very point — the training of ordinands of the right type, and training them in the right way; and by the right way I do not mean turning them out with a fixed

set of conclusions but with an open-minded reverence for truth and a disinterested desire to possess and use it in coöperation with the Spirit of Christ, for the moral and spiritual education and development of humanity. It is a clergy of this kind, learning, teaching, and working in close touch with humanity, who will provide a true theology, a living liturgy, and a vigorous and noble ethic for the English people.

As I view the prospects of English Modernism, besides drawing hope from those signs of the times to which I have referred, I also draw hope from the type of men and women who are Modernists. It is character which wins in the long run. It is the best index to the quality of a cause. A movement which has had such leaders as William Sanday, Hastings Rashdall, Lily Dougall, Clutton-Brock, Cyril Emmet, Maurice Pryke, Michael George Glazebrook, will not strike those who knew them as lacking in moral and spiritual force; and it is my privilege to know many other Modernists, both men and women, old and young, who give me an equal impression of Christian character.

I should not wish it to be supposed that I am here making any odious comparison with members of other schools in the English Church. It is not character which divides the best of all of them but intellectual outlook. That admirable prelate, Francis Paget, who from being Dean of Christ Church became Bishop of Oxford, has explained that difference in a sentence which goes to the root of the matter. He wrote:

There may be much that is striking in the easily-recognised adherence to a concise body of dogma, a compact scheme, an authority within four walls, but it is loyalty to every fragment of truth, to all its dim revealings, wherever they are vouchsafed, patient and faithful waiting, acceptance of all the discipline of incompleteness, that God looks for, I believe, from us, as our part, our service, for the truth's sake, while we are here.¹

Our opponents are unable to endure "the discipline of incompleteness." They feel that what God gives must be perfect. Now while we believe it to be very good, the whole evolutionary way of viewing the Universe indicates that it cannot be perfect. Perfection lies ahead. It is not given: it has to be gained. The Christian religion is a working faith, if you will, a working hypothesis; the Christian Church is a developing *organon* of the Spirit; even "the Christ that is to be" will be revealed to us as more majestic and complete than is the Jesus of history, because then we shall know Him not "after the flesh" but as He is. It is because the Modernist is deeply conscious of this that he turns once more to the Traditionalist and says, "Fellow Christian, I aim at no new religion, but I have a question to put to you. Are you really right in assuming that Christianity will lose its influence, if it exchange its Traditionalist belief in unalterable dogmas, fixed institutions, irruptionist Divine methods, for a belief in restatable dogmas, adaptable institutions, and a view of the Divine creative activity not in conflict

¹ *Life*, p. 114.

with science and history? And are you convinced that Christianity will be the poorer, if it be not only willing to possess these new convictions, but also resolved to put its new convictions into practice? In short, will you not exchange the static for the dynamic conception of Christianity? It is hard to imagine the enormous liberation which the whole-hearted adoption of this new and yet primitive outlook could achieve, and the strength and influence which the Church would gain by it. Truly it would be a launching out into the deep, but the miraculous draft of fishes would reward the act of faith. As fishers of *men* we English Churchmen, as a body, are making no great success of it to-day. What do you say to leaving the beach and your *amphiblestron*¹ and trying a little deep-sea fishing?"

Will the Traditionalist accept the Modernist's invitation? Perhaps he will, as the *amphiblestron* is not catching much nowadays. But whether he does or does not, of this I am certain, that the situation as described by the pen of one of our living English Modernists is prophetic — and his words reveal aspects of that situation which, as Bunyan's Christian said after being shown certain sights in the House of Mr. Interpreter, "put me in hope and fear." These are the concluding words of Mr. Alfred Fawkes's illuminating and inspiring essay, *The Genius of the English Church*,² and they shall be mine also.

¹ A circular casting net used by the Palestinian fisherman from the beach. Cf. *Matt.*, iv. 18. For deep-water fishing he used a net called *sagēnē*. *Matt.*, xiii. 47.

² Published by John Murray, 1917.

They speak perhaps more truly than they know who tell us that for the English Church the time in which we live is critical, that she has come to the parting of the ways. For the larger call is in her ears; she may hear it, and follow; or she may be deaf to it, and refrain. In other words, she may resign herself to the distinctive and denominational position of a mere Anglicanism or she may rise to her higher calling and stand for English Christianity as a whole. In the former case . . . she will rest on her past; she will appeal to the stationary elements of society — the unthinking, the unintelligent, those who for one reason or another stand outside the main stream of life. . . . But this road leads nowhere. A Church which takes it may be long in dying but is on the road to die. In the other case, a great, a very great, destiny awaits her — the furtherance of the religious life of the English people at home and beyond the seas. . . . She may unite . . . the best elements both of the old order and of the new. Should it be so, it is not England only that will be the gainer: the "*vasti luminis orae*" will receive increase.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

MODERNIST ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE
FAITH AND THE CREEDS, PUBLISHED IN THE "MOD-
ERN CHURCHMAN," vol. x, pp. 558-571

Answers to four questions issued by the World Conference of Faith and Order.

Questions

1. What degree of unity in Faith will be necessary in a reunited Church?
2. Is a statement of this one Faith in the form of a Creed necessary or desirable?
3. If so, what Creed should be used? or what other formulary would be desirable?
4. What are the proper uses of a Creed and of a Confession of Faith?

Professor PERCY GARDNER's answer:

The questions proposed by the Committee of the Conference have a special interest for members of the Churchmen's Union, since it is the especial concern of our society to find ways of expressing the essential truths of Christianity in a form suitable to modern conditions.

Questions 1 and 2 may be answered very briefly. It is clear that some degree of common belief is necessary. And such belief if stated in words, must needs take the shape of a creed or formula. At Geneva this was strongly asserted by some delegates and not, I think, explicitly denied by any.

Of course, it may be said that unity in Christian spirit is far more important than the common acceptance of creed or symbol. This is undeniably true. But what we are considering is an external and visible union. And though the spirit be of infinitely more importance than formulæ, it is possible to provide a verbal formula, whereas it is quite impossible to find any way of testing or deciding in what Church or denomination the Christian spirit really dwells. "The wind bloweth where it listeth: and thou canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." It is impossible to imagine any body of bishops, or any central committee, sitting down with the deliberate intention of deciding in what organized society the Spirit of Christ really resides. But such a committee could ask a society whether it would accept a formula.

The whole stress of the inquiry lies on questions 3 and 4, as to the nature of this common formula, and in what way it should be used.

There were at Geneva two distinct points of view as to the form which a declaration of faith should take. The first view would make it consist in passages taken from the earliest teaching of Christianity. Professor Robinson suggested that a very simple and early formula would serve. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." This phrase, however, is not so clear as it looks, since it includes the word Christ, which was in the time of Jesus very differently interpreted from what it might now mean. It is natural at once to suggest the Lord's Prayer, which is in fact a bond of union whenever Christians of various denominations meet together. But this prayer would be accepted also by almost any Jew; in fact, when the first Congress of Religions met at Chicago, it was repeated by an assembly comprising Hindus and Mohammedans. By itself, therefore, it is

insufficient as a confession of Christian faith. Others might suggest the selection of a few of the most authentic sayings of Jesus, collected from the Synoptic Gospels. But these again would be accepted by liberal Jews, and indeed they belong to universal religion. Besides this, it is unsatisfactory and unhistoric to confine Christianity to that which it was in the lifetime of the Founder. We should not exclude the beliefs which arose in the Church after her Founder had departed in the body, but was still present in the spirit, leading and inspiring. If the compilation of a formula in the very words of Jesus be thus at once inadequate and too comprehensive, the only alternative seems to be to accept in a broad and modified way one of the early formulæ of the Church. Of the creeds accepted by the English Church, the so-called Nicene Creed is to be preferred to that called the Apostles' Creed, because it has had far more general acceptance in the Church, and although it seems more abstruse, it is really nearer to actual modern beliefs. It lays less emphasis on historic facts which may be disputed, and more on Christian doctrine.

I say the "so-called Nicene Creed," because, as is generally known, it is not that formulated at the Council of Nicæa, but an expansion and modification of it. We may fairly leave it to some learned committee to decide what is the best and most authentic form of that creed. Broadly speaking, we may regard it as the best and most authoritative expression of Christian belief formulated by the early Church, at the time of the passing of the ancient civilization. There is, however, one clause in the creed as it stands, "proceeding from the Father and the Son," which is not accepted by any of the eastern churches. It would obviously have, in deference to them, to be omitted. There are other clauses in the creed which are not accepted by anyone in a

literal sense, or in the sense in which they were understood by the formulators, but it would be difficult to remove them without endless dispute, and unnecessary if adherence to the creed was general and historic, not individual.

The ancient and beautiful *Te Deum*, so familiar to us in the English Church, might be suggested as an alternative. It embodies similar beliefs to those formulated in the creed, but expresses them in a less formal way, and adds something which is more essentially Christian than any mere formula, implying sense of sin, and dependence every day on the divine help. Neither of these statements of belief really includes the more important parts of Christian belief, those which arise out of personal experience, the keen hatred of sin, the desire of forgiveness, the hope of divine grace, the aspiration after eternal life. Such beliefs are embodied for the English Church in the Articles of Religion. But these unfortunately are expressed in a language now mostly out of date. In any case, there could hardly be made, with any prospect of success, a scheme of doctrine on such subjects as these which would be accepted by all denominations of Christians.

Here question 4 comes in: and it seems to me the most important of all. In what sense are churches and individuals to accept the general formula, and when are they to repeat it? The Creed was not really meant, in spite of appearances, as a mere formula, to be received and repeated as a matter of intellectual assent. It was an attempt, however imperfect, to enclose in formulæ the working belief of the Christian society. And it is only in that light that it has value. The Fathers at Nicæa did not assert "I believe" but "We believe." They tried to express the general view of the Church. The "I believe" of the English Church is most unfortunate,

indicating an individualism in religion which is remote from early Christianity. If each of us studied the New Testament in a leisurely way, with all the critical helps of modern times, we should all arrive at somewhat different results, according to the intellectual and moral temperament of each of us. Every scholar knows that in matters of history and philosophy, complete intellectual agreement is neither possible nor desirable. But recent writers on psychology have shown that a nation, a church, any organized society, has a corporate personality greater than the sum of the personalities who compose the society. The Creeds belong to societies rather than to individuals, and express corporate rather than personal beliefs. Complete personal acquiescence cannot be expected. Some may receive the Creed on authority and submit to it; but this is a very different thing from really believing it. What will happen in most cases is that individuals will have a respect for the Creed as a whole, and personally strongly believe in most of it. But as regards some clauses they are sure to have reservations. They will assent to it generally as belonging to the great majority of the Society of which they are a part, and with which they have strong sympathy.

In fact, Christians have a right to move in this matter on the same lines as they move on in relation to the New Testament. We cannot even put the creed on a higher level than the Lord's Prayer, and other well-attested sayings of our Lord. The English Church, in particular, places Scripture above the Creed, and affirms that the Creed depends upon Scripture for its authority. Yet our Church allows clergymen to declare only in general terms their belief in the authority of Scripture. Such general belief in any Creed accepted by a reunited Church is certainly all that any branch of it could re-

quire of laity or clergy. It is to be a bond to unite, not a text to separate, Christians. It might be said or sung at the more solemn assemblies and festivals, or more often, according to the decision of the governing bodies of local churches.

Thus in the use of any creed the historic and general, rather than the individual, point of view is important. Its acceptance would really show an adhesion to the main body of Christians, a claim to continue the life of the early Church, an eagerness to be a part of the body of Christ on earth, rather than any mere intellectual or historic view. In no other way can unity among freely thinking and intelligent men be secured.

From SIR WILLIAM ASHLEY, Ph.D., late Vice-Principal of Birmingham University, and Churchwarden of Birmingham Cathedral.

It is difficult to be brief without seeming to be peremptory. But the risk must be incurred, if the answers to the questions of the Continuation Committee of the World's Conference on Faith and Order are not to swell to the proportions of an essay.

1. The only faith in which it is necessary that the Church of Jesus Christ should be united is the Faith of Jesus Christ Himself; and that can be sufficiently collected from our Lord's own prayer. But this principle does not exclude the possibility that the several national or denominational branches of the Church might, profitably for themselves, make use of "symbols" more or less special to themselves. The only practicable ideal, for a long time to come, is unity in diversity.

2 and 3. It is not necessary that the common Faith should be stated in the form of a Creed: since it is better expressed in the language of devotion than in the language of philosophy or history.

4. The proper or improper uses of a Creed depend on the character of the Creed. A Creed composed in our Lord's own language, and breathing the spirit of aspiration and trust, might well be used in many connections. But the only proper use of the existing Creeds, or others like them, is as significant historical documents, to be explained and commented upon by qualified expositors at appropriate times. They are unsuitable for congregational use in public worship. And if — though this is undesirable — they are employed in the rites of admission either to the Church or to the ministry, the formula of adhesion should be of a very general character.

From the Right Hon. LORD CHARNWOOD, sometime Tutor of Balliol and M.P. for Woodstock, author of "Abraham Lincoln," Member of the Church Assembly, etc.

1. A Christian is one who seeks to be a disciple of Jesus Christ, and while his theory as to how or why our Lord can claim his discipleship is unimportant, his readiness to find in our Lord's teaching, life, and death the guide of his life and the light of his mind is vital. Correspondingly, a branch of the true Church is a body of men and women who are in fact associated together to help one another in this fellowship with, and following of, Jesus Christ. Its articles of belief are relatively unimportant, but that its real aim should be the discipleship of the actual historic Jesus Christ is vital. If this be let go, the very essence of Christianity is liable to assume the form of a mere philosophy, which is for a cultured few, or an ethical code which, as such, is necessarily imperfect and negative. Churches reuniting must be able to recognize one another as offering some guarantee of permanent loyalty to Jesus Christ. I think that the possession of some sort of ordered ministry and the use of the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion

— simple institutions which seem to many people to have been prescribed for this purpose by our Lord Himself — must be taken as requisites of every Church with which as a Church (and not with its members as individuals) such association as can be called reunion is possible. I think nothing more is requisite. But I do expect all Churchmen to accept this, or desire to delay all measures of union till they do.

2. The use or avoidance of a Creed seems to me one of the chief instances of those differences of custom which should be no barrier to coöperation or to the sense of union between Christian bodies. Some of us (including myself) like the use of such a historic document as the Nicene Creed, apart from our literal acceptance or rejection of certain articles in it. To others any such formulation of belief would be jarring, apart from their belief or disbelief of any article in it, because it is a formulation of belief. This ought not to be regarded as a difference of faith, nor (since people who like a Creed do not always believe all of it) would any purpose really be served by regarding this matter as fundamental.

3. If, however, as is likely, most people would like to see some standard of belief set up by every Church with which they were in any sort of union, I suggest the answer in the Catechism, to the question, "What dost thou chiefly learn in these articles of thy belief?" as a model which it would be hard to surpass.

4. But, I think that the real place of a creed is in the worship, more particularly in the Eucharist, of the Churches which like such formularies, and that the use of any creed or articles as a test of Church membership will always fail to accomplish the purpose for which it is really intended.

From the late A. CLUTTON-BROCK, Esq., author of "The Ultimate Belief," "Studies in Christianity," etc., etc.

1. The value of a reunited Church would be in its diversity. We have not now the need for a strict uniformity which was imposed upon the Early Church because of its desire to differentiate itself sharply from all kinds of paganism. The trouble with modern Christianity is that its dogmas no longer express its unity of faith. They only express diversity, in the main obsolete.

2. I believe that a statement of this unity of faith is needed, but,

3. I do not think that any of the existing creeds do express the real Christian unity of faith. What is needed is a new creed that shall express, in current terms, that unity.

4. The use of a creed is that people know whether or not they really agree with the body professing that creed. This function is not performed by any of the existing creeds. On the contrary, the aim of most Christians — who wish to remain members of the Church is, by some means or other, to accommodate the statements of the existing creeds to their real beliefs. The production of a real and efficient creed would be difficult, but it is, I think, a necessity.

From G. G. COULTON, Esq., M.A., Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge, author of "Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation," "Christ, St. Francis and To-day," etc., etc.

I should find it difficult to answer these questions from any but the most definitely opportunist standpoint. For many centuries, nearly all the Churches have claimed to base themselves upon "historical" grounds,

of which some never did come within the domain of history proper, while others are increasingly regarded by historians as unproven, or even disproved. Therefore we of this generation have inherited a preponderatingly negative task; and, while we look forward to a higher constructive policy, we feel that none such can come so long as (to put it with brutal frankness) the bread and butter of a whole family may depend upon the breadwinner's continued acceptance of formulas which were designed for past generations. *For the present*, therefore, I should answer:

1. That we ought to welcome to our churches all who have any religion whatever: all who believe that there is a right worth fighting for, a wrong worth fighting against, and something infinitely higher than ourselves, to which we are brought nearer by common worship. However that man's religion, or ultimate analysis, may differ from our own, if he believes that he comes nearer to God by worshipping with us, it would be unchristian in us to forbid him (Mark, ix, 38). If such liberty be found mischievous, Christendom will certainly react from it in due time: we have enough faith in God and Christ to believe that. Meanwhile, the policy of exclusion having utterly failed, let us try a policy of inclusion which has far more Gospel authority.

2. To this I should answer: "*Desirable*, but not *necessary*." Let us strive for a formula which will lead to unity; but, if all the formulas we can now think of are found to lead rather to division, then let us leave the problem to a wiser generation than our own.

3. If a creed must be used, I should be in sympathy with "A Modern Churchman's Creed."

We believe that God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.

We believe that God is Light, and that if we walk in

the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

We believe that God is Love, and that everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in His Son.

We believe that we are children of God, and that He hath given us of His Spirit.

We believe that if we confess our sins He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

We believe that the world passeth away and the lust thereof, but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever. Amen.

4. I look upon their proper use as devotional; certainly not as a test. The world is ripe, and over-ripe, for the abolition of religious tests. If the real effect of such abolition, as some tell us, would be to destroy all that now calls itself the Church of Christ, we for our part believe in a Christ who would rebuild this temple, and that the glory of this latter house would be greater than the former.

From SIR HARRY R. REICHEL, LL.D., Principal of University College, North Wales; sometime Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford.

I. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." St. Peter's ejaculation is the instinctive cry of the Christian soul. Personal devotion to our Lord as the final revelation to humanity of the Divine nature is the *differentia* of Christianity. This and not intellectual belief in a theological system is the meaning of Christian faith. Like all spiritual activities, faith involves intellectual operations, but its ultimate truths

are spiritually, not intellectually, discerned. Theology stands in much the same relation to religious faith as psychology to friendship. The human mind will always endeavour, and rightly endeavour, to reduce to a coherent intellectual system the phenomena of human life, in which are included those embraced in religious experience. Every generation, therefore, will have its own theology and its own psychology; but religious faith is as independent of the one as friendship is of the other.

2. It is impossible to avoid the formulation of a creed. If any society be formed, it must be for some object or ideal. This object or ideal must be expressed in words, and such expression in the case of religion is virtually a creed.

3. All that can be done is to see that this creed is as fundamental, as simple, and as free from detail as possible. A good example of this, as applied to a body of Christians, is the declaration of personal allegiance to our Lord which is, or used to be, made by members of the Christian Student Movement.

4. The use of a simple creed, as described above, apart from its necessity for defining the *raison d'être* of the Christian Society, is of distinct value in public worship, through the sense of spiritual fellowship it tends to foster by concentrating the minds of the congregation in one transcendent moment on the central truth which is the cause of their existence as a society, and its life.

From Professor BETHUNE-BAKER, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, editor of the "Journal of Theological Studies," author of "The Faith of the Apostles' Creed," etc., etc.

I hold that a Church must stand for some definite convictions, and that these must be convictions capable

of being stated as a creed. I do not think that the common convictions for which the Church stands could be stated by any selection of words of Christ, nor that they can be stated except in a form analogous to that of the ancient creeds — the implications of these convictions being left to be drawn out from them rather than expressed in credal form.

It does not seem possible or desirable to revise or re-write any one of the ancient creeds, nor to continue to use them for any other purpose than as devotional canticles and historical landmarks. Yet the recitation of a creed gives point to the action of worship that nothing else can give, and a creed is of real value for the purpose of instruction.

I think that an adaptation of phrases from the ancient creeds, with perhaps some slight modernizations, might furnish a sufficient creed for a reunited Church — something like the following:

I believe in God, Maker of all things visible and invisible in human life

And in Jesus Christ, His Son, our Lord, God manifest in human life,

Crucified for us, risen from the dead, ascended into heaven.

And in the Spirit of the Father and the Son:

One holy Catholic Church, one Baptism unto forgiveness of sins, one Eucharist, one Fellowship of the Faithful:

And in the life of the world to come.

But it would probably be quite impossible to get agreement as to any such creed.

From Canon T. H. BINDLEY, D.D., sometime Archdeacon of Barbados; author of "The Œcumenical Documents of the Faith," etc., etc.

1. Nothing beyond personal devotion to our Lord Jesus Christ as the Supreme Revealer of the Love of God, and as *Salvator Mundi*.

2. The statement of this faith in a credal formula is neither necessary nor desirable.

Questions 3 and 4 do not arise, if these answers to 1 and 2 are accepted.

*From the Ven. R. H. CHARLES, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.,
Archdeacon of Westminster, author of "A Critical
History of the Doctrine of a Future Life," etc., etc.*

1. Faith is trust in a person, not belief in a doctrine, though faith must find expression in intellectual terms. Hence the degree of unity necessary appears to be faith in God as revealed in Christ in the greatest fullness possible in our humanity, and in the presence of God's Spirit in the hearts of men.

2. Yes, it is desirable if possible.

3. Possibly the Apostles' Creed, reëdited in the light of God's subsequent revelation in man's spiritual experience, thought and history, and in science. Of the three paragraphs in this creed, the first can stand as it is. The third requires only the change of "resurrection of the flesh" into "resurrection of the dead," (as in the Nicene Creed), that is, a resurrection of persons, not of dead bodies. The second paragraph needs several changes, as in the phrases "descended into hell," "ascended into heaven," etc. The words "the Virgin" and "the third day" might be left out, or if retained, a footnote added, that belief in the literal truth of these phrases was not binding on Churchmen. In the original form of the Nicene Creed, adopted at Nicæa, A.D. 325, there is no reference to the Virgin birth. It simply gives *σαρκωθέντα*, to which the Nicene-Constantinopolitan

Creed of 381 adds "by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary."

4. The individual can assimilate only some of the truths that are possible to human experience. Hence the proper use of a creed is to embrace the collective spiritual experience of the Church. At the best, even the collective experience of the Church is partial, and but a faint reflection of the infinite range of truth to be assimilated in the blessed immortality beyond the grave.

N. B. If the above changes and excisions are not made, then a note should be appended to the creed, allowing to those who profess it the right of reinterpretation in accordance with the growth of knowledge. This creed could then be the symbol alike of those who took every clause literally and of those who could not do so.

From the late Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., Fellow of University College and Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford; author of "Conscience Creeds and Critics," "The Eschatological Question in the Gospels," etc., etc.

1. Unity of faith should be understood as the personal acceptance of Christ as Lord, Saviour, and supreme revelation of the Father, and of the ideals which He embodied and taught. I should lay considerable stress upon the last clause, as removing the emphasis from orthodoxy of belief to a loyal readiness to work for the Kingdom of God.

2. Yes, on the understanding that it is not regarded as absolute or final. The true personal discipleship of (1) is consistent with a great variety of theological outlook, but the Church as a whole must attempt to work

out the implications of her faith, and her best apprehension of this in any age may reasonably be embodied in a creed always regarded as relative and subordinate.

3. The Nicene Creed is probably the best which is yet available. Granted the setting of the problems as they were presented in the first centuries, Catholic Christianity was right every time in its rejection of heresies, though they often contained suggestions of truth which it failed to follow up. But we should look forward to a creed of the future, which should not be the work of individuals or of one school, but, like the Nicene Creed, the expression of the best mind of the Church as a whole. This creed will probably be more scriptural in its phraseology, with greater stress on moral requirements and personal experience.

It may be pointed out that God is teaching to our age a better method of seeking for the truth, the way of fellowship as exemplified in the Faith and Order Conferences and many other similar gatherings. Unless we take a mechanical view of revelation, we must be able under these conditions to enter further into the mind of God than was possible in the atmosphere and personal intrigue in which the early formularies of the Church grew up.

4. A creed should not be regarded as a "test" which must be accepted by individuals, whether laity or clergy, as a condition of membership or office, but as the general standard of the Church's teaching. It should not be the fence which must be surmounted in order to enter in the fold, but the goal towards which we work. This is the method of Christ, who began with personal discipleship. It may be pointed out that in the Anglican Communion we inherit a system of which we reasonably try to make the best: it is another thing to expect Churches, which are now free from this drawback, de-

liberately to accept a new yoke. Further, the variety of the present situation provides safeguards: those who find themselves unable to accept the tests of any particular communion can now unite themselves with some other Christian body. A united Church, insisting, *e. g.*, on the Nicene Christology as a condition of membership, would leave those who cannot accept it with no other refuge. Tests have really only been tolerable so far because of this variety: the more the Church becomes one, the less can it insist upon them.

From the Rev. F. E. HUTCHINSON, M.A., Hulsean Lecturer 1918-1919; author of "Christian Freedom," etc., etc.

I submit that the whole idea of *Credenda* to be required of members of Christ's Church is foreign to the mind of Christ, and is in a different category from the "faith" or moral act of trust which He sought to elicit from His followers. No Church of the future which insists on narrower conditions of discipleship than Christ Himself asked for will deserve the name of Catholic.

There will always be a use for acts of loyalty in Christian worship: we need more of them, and some of them may well be framed from the New Testament, while others may be in the terms of our own day: the latter we shall not expect to serve beyond our day, and we shall hope that they will be improved upon by those who succeed us. If they are cast in the form of hymns, like the *Te Deum*, the worshippers will understand that they are left free to appropriate them, as they do other hymns, in their own way. But if such confessions of faith, whether ancient or modern, are to be used as instruments of inquisitorial scrutiny, they will prove divisive to the end of time: whereas it is always possible

to find unity in our common discipleship of Jesus Christ, and even to express it in common worship, provided that the individual believer is encouraged to enter into as full sympathy as he conscientiously can with his fellow-worshippers, with no expectation that they will all think alike. Difference in matters of opinion is no bar to very real fellowship in common life, and should be no impediment to fellowship in Christ's Church, where the desire to be in sympathy with one another should be at its maximum.

From the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., author of "Studies in Modernism," "The Genius of the English Church," etc.

1. The unity required is, I think, that of the Baptismal Confession, on which the earliest creed was based. This should (I think) include the moral profession made in answer to the first, third, and fourth "demand" in the Prayer Book Baptismal Service.

It would, I think, be well, mainly for historical reasons, to preserve the use of the Apostles' Creed, substituting "body" for "flesh" in the eleventh article (as is done in Morning and Evening Prayer). But, if this is objected to, the creed is too venerable a document to be tinkered up; and a simple Trinitarian formula, based upon it, might be used: such, *e. g.*, as that given in the Church Catechism in answer to the question, "What dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy Belief?"

2. It is not necessary. But it is, I think, desirable. And, in the case of the Church of England, it fits in — like liturgical worship and the episcopal form of government — with the historical genius of this Church.

3. Either the Apostles' Creed, or some such Baptismal Confession as has been suggested in 1. Anything like a new creed would be a mischievous anachronism:

mischievous, because questions of interpretation, which are (or should be) excluded in the case of a historical document, would be raised; an anachronism, because the age of creed-making is past.

4. Historical, as linking the many generations of Christians together, and devotional, as presenting a concise reminder of the things eternal. Creeds are not limits set to theological thought: on the contrary, they are products of theological thought, which devours its offspring. And, as our Article VIII states, they are secondary to and dependent on Scripture. So that, on the one hand, "although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation" (Article XX); and, on the other, new knowledge of Scripture necessitates, in certain cases, new interpretation of the creeds.

From the Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., C.V.O., Dean of St. Paul's, Bampton Lecturer, Gifford Lecturer, etc., etc.

1. I do not see any possible basis of reunion between Catholic and Protestant Churches. The differences are fundamental.

2-4. I should keep the *Te Deum* and drop the "Three Creeds."

From the Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., author of "A Parson in the Australian Bush," "The Faith of an Average Man," and editor of "Faith or Fear?" and "Faith and Freedom."

1. Personally I do not think that there is any hope of permanent reunion, except on a very wide basis. There must, it seems to me, be a common faith in Jesus Christ

out the implications of her faith, and her best apprehension of this in any age may reasonably be embodied in a creed always regarded as relative and subordinate.

3. The Nicene Creed is probably the best which is yet available. Granted the setting of the problems as they were presented in the first centuries, Catholic Christianity was right every time in its rejection of heresies, though they often contained suggestions of truth which it failed to follow up. But we should look forward to a creed of the future, which should not be the work of individuals or of one school, but, like the Nicene Creed, the expression of the best mind of the Church as a whole. This creed will probably be more scriptural in its phraseology, with greater stress on moral requirements and personal experience.

It may be pointed out that God is teaching to our age a better method of seeking for the truth, the way of fellowship as exemplified in the Faith and Order Conferences and many other similar gatherings. Unless we take a mechanical view of revelation, we must be able under these conditions to enter further into the mind of God than was possible in the atmosphere and personal intrigue in which the early formularies of the Church grew up.

4. A creed should not be regarded as a "test" which must be accepted by individuals, whether laity or clergy, as a condition of membership or office, but as the general standard of the Church's teaching. It should not be the fence which must be surmounted in order to enter in the fold, but the goal towards which we work. This is the method of Christ, who began with personal discipleship. It may be pointed out that in the Anglican Communion we inherit a system of which we reasonably try to make the best: it is another thing to expect Churches, which are now free from this drawback, de-

liberately to accept a new yoke. Further, the variety of the present situation provides safeguards: those who find themselves unable to accept the tests of any particular communion can now unite themselves with some other Christian body. A united Church, insisting, *e. g.*, on the Nicene Christology as a condition of membership, would leave those who cannot accept it with no other refuge. Tests have really only been tolerable so far because of this variety: the more the Church becomes one, the less can it insist upon them.

From the Rev. F. E. HUTCHINSON, M.A., Hulsean Lecturer 1918-1919; author of "Christian Freedom," etc., etc.

I submit that the whole idea of *Credenda* to be required of members of Christ's Church is foreign to the mind of Christ, and is in a different category from the "faith" or moral act of trust which He sought to elicit from His followers. No Church of the future which insists on narrower conditions of discipleship than Christ Himself asked for will deserve the name of Catholic.

There will always be a use for acts of loyalty in Christian worship: we need more of them, and some of them may well be framed from the New Testament, while others may be in the terms of our own day: the latter we shall not expect to serve beyond our day, and we shall hope that they will be improved upon by those who succeed us. If they are cast in the form of hymns, like the *Te Deum*, the worshippers will understand that they are left free to appropriate them, as they do other hymns, in their own way. But if such confessions of faith, whether ancient or modern, are to be used as instruments of inquisitorial scrutiny, they will prove divisive to the end of time: whereas it is always possible

to find unity in our common discipleship of Jesus Christ, and even to express it in common worship, provided that the individual believer is encouraged to enter into as full sympathy as he conscientiously can with his fellow-worshippers, with no expectation that they will all think alike. Difference in matters of opinion is no bar to very real fellowship in common life, and should be no impediment to fellowship in Christ's Church, where the desire to be in sympathy with one another should be at its maximum.

From the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., author of "Studies in Modernism," "The Genius of the English Church," etc.

1. The unity required is, I think, that of the Baptismal Confession, on which the earliest creed was based. This should (I think) include the moral profession made in answer to the first, third, and fourth "demand" in the Prayer Book Baptismal Service.

It would, I think, be well, mainly for historical reasons, to preserve the use of the Apostles' Creed, substituting "body" for "flesh" in the eleventh article (as is done in Morning and Evening Prayer). But, if this is objected to, the creed is too venerable a document to be tinkered up; and a simple Trinitarian formula, based upon it, might be used: such, *e. g.*, as that given in the Church Catechism in answer to the question, "What dost thou chiefly learn in these Articles of thy Belief?"

2. It is not necessary. But it is, I think, desirable. And, in the case of the Church of England, it fits in — like liturgical worship and the episcopal form of government — with the historical genius of this Church.

3. Either the Apostles' Creed, or some such Baptismal Confession as has been suggested in 1. Anything like a new creed would be a mischievous anachronism:

mischievous, because questions of interpretation, which are (or should be) excluded in the case of a historical document, would be raised; an anachronism, because the age of creed-making is past.

4. Historical, as linking the many generations of Christians together, and devotional, as presenting a concise reminder of the things eternal. Creeds are not limits set to theological thought: on the contrary, they are products of theological thought, which devours its offspring. And, as our Article VIII states, they are secondary to and dependent on Scripture. So that, on the one hand, "although the Church be a witness and a keeper of holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so, besides the same, ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation" (Article XX); and, on the other, new knowledge of Scripture necessitates, in certain cases, new interpretation of the creeds.

From the Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., C.V.O., Dean of St. Paul's, Bampton Lecturer, Gifford Lecturer, etc., etc.

1. I do not see any possible basis of reunion between Catholic and Protestant Churches. The differences are fundamental.

2-4. I should keep the *Te Deum* and drop the "Three Creeds."

From the Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., author of "A Parson in the Australian Bush," "The Faith of an Average Man," and editor of "Faith or Fear?" and "Faith and Freedom."

1. Personally I do not think that there is any hope of permanent reunion, except on a very wide basis. There must, it seems to me, be a common faith in Jesus Christ

as the one Lord and Master of us all, or we should have no right to call the Church Christian at all.

It follows that we must be prepared to use the Pater-noster together, with all that that implies of unity and of belief as in the true character of the God and Father of all. And reunion is obviously only to be looked for by those who believe in the power and guidance of the Holy Spirit. This obviously involves in itself a unity in faith. And further, there can obviously be no desire for *organic* unity without the underlying belief that the Church is ideally a visible as well as an invisible fellowship.

2. I am inclined to think that some credal statement will be found to be necessary for the Church as a Church. But I believe that the speaker at the Geneva Conference, who said that "Creeds in the past have been, not unifying, but dividing," is right; and I think that a new creed, "the shorter the better," — to quote another speaker at the Conference, — possibly in the actual words of Scripture, would be a better basis for reunion than any ancient creed.

3. I have already answered this question in part, but I want to add that I see no reason why the Nicene Creed should not be accepted as Dr. Anderson Scott would accept it, as an historical document to be reinterpreted continually, in the light of "all the experience and powers of interpretation of experience given us by God in the last fifteen centuries."

4. The true use of a creed seems to me to be as a symbol of our unity in time of worship. It certainly should not be used as a test of individual orthodoxy, either for laity or ministers. The logical issue of such an attitude as that taken up by Bishop Gore at the Conference seems to me to be to render utterly impossible any reunion at all.

From the late Very Rev. H. RASHDALL, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., Dean of Carlisle; Bampton Lecturer, 1915; author of numerous historical, theological, and philosophical works.

I. I do not think it possible to answer this question in an abstract form. When a question of actual reunion between the Church of England and any other church or churches arises, I should welcome reunion on any terms which did not further narrow the doctrinal basis of the former; and I do not think that in the near future any such reunion would be possible which did not involve the acceptance of at least the Apostles' and the (so-called) Constantinopolitan Creed. That is, of course, a very different thing from saying that those Creeds are to be regarded as for all time the only possible basis of Christian union. If the question be not of reunion, but of such mutual recognition as is implied in occasional interchange of pulpits and occasional intercommunion, I should greatly regret that the recognition should be confined to Churches which formally accepted these two creeds, and I do not think it would be a very hopeful policy to attempt to draw up a doctrinal minimum, the acceptance of which should be a condition of the mutual recognition. For this purpose no common statement of belief seems to be required. Whether a particular Nonconformist minister should be invited to take part in an Anglican service, and whether a particular clergyman of our Church should accept an invitation to take part in a Nonconformist service, are questions which could best be decided *ad hoc* by the clergyman issuing or receiving the invitation, with the approval of his bishop.

If the question be one of some coöperation or federation closer than this, but falling short of actual reunion,

the necessity of a common creed would depend upon the nature and closeness of the coöperation or federation proposed.

2 and 3. My answer to these two questions is implied in my answer to question 1:

4. A creed or confession of faith is required: (a) As a Baptismal Creed to be accepted on admission to the Church. (b) For use in worship. (c) For acceptance as a condition of admission to the ministry. For all these purposes I should look forward ultimately to the adoption of some simpler formula than the existing creeds. I do not think that at the present moment there is any chance of such a simplified creed being accepted for any of these purposes, but it might come for the first two earlier than for the third.

From the Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A., Headmaster of King Edward's School, Southampton, and sometime Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, and Assistant Master at Harrow.

1. The degree of unity in faith in the reunited Church as a whole is necessarily measured by the condition required to be fulfilled for Church membership. This condition ought to ignore the gradually developed doctrine of the Church, however true and important in itself, and to be as like as we can make it to the Lord's own test of discipleship. This simply involved the acceptance of Himself as Master and Teacher. Inasmuch as His teaching proclaimed that love was the principle of life, and thus was both (a) the essence of the Divine nature, and (b) the ideal of human conduct, I should be in favour of making explicit in the test for Churchmanship this conception of the character of God and this interpretation of goodness as consisting in the service of men.

2. I think a statement in the form of a creed is necessary.

3. No existing creed would serve the purpose of 1. We need a new formulary after the manner of the following: "I believe that God is Love; I accept Jesus Christ as my Master and Teacher; I acknowledge that it is the will of God that I should love and serve my fellow-men."

4. Such a confession should be required from persons to be baptized, confirmed, ordained, or consecrated, as the necessary and sufficient test of orthodoxy. It might well be used on special occasions in corporate worship, but it should not be a necessary part of the services on ordinary occasions. Its position in the Prayer-Book should be such as to show that it was regarded as fundamental not only in Christian worship, but in all Christian life (*e. g.*, it might be printed in the centre of the first page, the rest of the page being blank).

APPENDIX II

ARCHBISHOPS' DOCTRINAL COMMISSION.

The *Times*, Friday, October 2, 1925

We have received the following official statement on the work of the Archbishops' Doctrinal Commission:

The Commission appointed in 1923 by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to consider points of agreement and difference within the Church of England on matters of doctrine met in full session at Queen's College, Oxford, from September 21 to 25. The Commission has suffered a grievous loss through the resignation, and subsequent death, of its first chairman, the late Bishop of Oxford. To him the initiation of the Commission was very largely due, and the unity of feeling which marks the Commission is in great measure the fruit of his leadership. His successor as chairman is the Bishop of Manchester.

The task before the Commission is plainly a very big one, and the work is not of the sort that can be hurried, owing to the amount of preparatory labour that has to be done between the full sessions. Its discussions have dealt with the various kinds of authority for religious belief and with the doctrine of God, especially with the relation between justice and love in God, and with His relation to the world both in miracle and otherwise. While it has not yet been possible to reach complete agreement, there has been a far greater approach to it than most people who know the widely divergent school of thought represented would have anticipated. The Commission is encouraged to hope that its labours may

enable it to help materially the growth of mutual understanding and closer agreement in the Church of England, partly by showing that views often regarded as divergent are in fact complementary, partly (when this proves impossible) by elucidating the precise points at which unresolved differences exist. In this hope the Commission asks that Christian people will support it with their prayers. At the session just concluded the following were present throughout: The Bishop of Manchester (chairman), the Rev. F. R. Barry, Prebendary E. J. Bicknell, the Rev. J. M. Creed, Archdeacon J. R. Darbyshire, the Rev. L. W. Grensted, the Rev. W. L. Knox, the Rev. W. R. Matthews, Mr. W. H. Moberly, the Rev. J. K. Mozley, Canon Quick, the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, the Rev. C. F. Russell, the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare, Mr. Will Spens, Canon Storr, Canon Streeter, Professor A. E. Taylor, the Rev. L. S. Thornton, C. R., Professor C. C. J. Webb, and Canon H. A. Wilson.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLEN, A. V. G. *The Continuity of Christian Thought*, Ward, Lock, and Co., 1884. *Freedom in the Church*, Macmillan, 1907.
- ANSON, HAROLD. *A Practical Faith*, Allen and Unwin, 1925.
- ASHLEY, W. J. *The Christian Outlook*, Longmans, 1925.
- BAKER, J. F. BETHUNE. *The Miracle of Christianity*, Longmans, 1914. *The Faith of the Apostles' Creed*, Macmillan, 1918.
- BARNES, ERNEST, and MAJOR, H. D. A. *The Sacraments and Modern Research*, Blackwell, 1925.
- BOUQUET, A. C. *Is Christianity the Final Religion?* Macmillan, 1921. *The Christian Religion and its Competitors To-day*, Cambridge University Press, 1925.
- BRANFORD, VICTOR. *Living Religions*, 1924.
- BROCK, A. CLUTTON. *The Ultimate Belief*, Constable, 1916.
- BROWN, W. A. *The Essence of Christianity*, Scribner, 1902. *Modern Theology and the Preaching of the Gospel*, Scribner, 1914.
- BURKITT, F. C. *The Failure of Liberal Christianity and Some Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed*, Bowes, 1910.
- CAMPBELL, R. J. *The New Theology*, Chapman and Hall, 1907.
- CARNEGIE, W. H. *Anglicanism*, Putnam, 1925.
- CHARLES, R. H. *Eschatologies, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian*, 1899. *Between the Testaments*, 1914. *Adventures into the Unknown*, 1923.
- COHU, J. R. Oremus, 1908. *The Old Testament in the Light of Modern Research*, 1908. *The Gospels and Modern Research*, 1909. *St. Paul and Modern Research*, 1911. *Through Evolution to the Living God*, 1912. *Vital Problems of Religion*, 1914. *The Evolution of the Christian Ministry*, 1918. *The Bible and Modern Thought*, 1920.
- DOUGALL, LILY. *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*, Macmillan, 1901. *Christus Futurus*, 1909.

- DOUGALL, L., and EMMET, C. W. *The Lord of Thought*, 1922.
- EDGHILL, E. A. *Faith and Fact*, 1910. *The Spirit of Power*, 1910. *The Revelation of the Son of God*, 1911.
- EMMET, CYRIL W. *Conscience, Creeds and Critics*, Macmillan, 1918.
- FAWKES, ALFRED. *Studies in Modernism*, Murray, 1913. *The Genius of the English Church*, 1917.
- FITZROY, A. I. *Dogma and the Church of England*, Blackwood, 1891.
- FOSDICK, H. E. *The Modern Use of the Bible*, 1924.
- FREMANTLE, W. H. *The World as the Subject of Redemption*, 1885.
- GAMBLE, JOHN. *Christian Faith and Worship*, 1912.
- GARDNER, ALICE. *The History of Sacrament*, 1921.
- GARDNER, PERCY. *A Historic View of the New Testament*, 1901. *Exploratio Evangelica*, 2nd ed., 1907. *The Growth of Christianity*, 1907. *Modernity and the Churches*, 1909. *Evolution in Christian Doctrine*, 1918. *Evolution in Christian Ethics*, 1918. *The Practical Basis of Christian Belief*, 1923. *Modernism in the English Church*, 1926.
- GLAZEBROOK, M. G. *The Faith of a Modern Churchman*, Murray, 1918.
- GWATKIN, H. M. *The Knowledge of God*, 1908. *The Bishop of Oxford's Open Letter*, 1914.
- HALDANE, J. S. *Mechanism, Life, and Personality*, Murray, 1918.
- HALL, FRANCIS J. *Christianity and Modernism*, Edwin S. Gorham, 1924.
- HANDLEY, HUBERT. *A Declaration on Biblical Criticism*, A. and C. Black, 1906. *Anglican Liberalism*, 1908. *Theological Room*, Constable, 1914.
- HANKEY, DONALD. *The Lord of All Good Life. A Student in Arms*, Andrew Melrose, 1919.
- HARDWICK, J. C. *Religion and Science*, S. P. C. K., 1910.
- HENSON, H. HENSLEY. *Sincerity and Subscription*, Macmillan, 1903. *The Creed in the Pulpit*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1912.
- HORT, F. J. A. *The Way, The Truth, The Life*, Hulsean Lectures. Published with Appendix, 1893.

- HUTTON, A. W. *Ecclesia Discens*, Francis Griffiths, 1904.
- INGE, W. R. *Christian Mysticism*, 1899. *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*, 1906. *Outspoken Essays*, First Series, 1920. *Outspoken Essays*, Second Series, 1922.
- JEVONS, F. B. *Introduction to the History of Religion*, 6th ed., 1914.
- KELSALL, J. E. *The Child Enthroned and Other Sermons*, Warren, Winchester, 1925.
- LAKE, KIRSOPP. *The Stewardship of Faith*, 1915. *Landmarks of Early Christianity*, 1920. *The Religion of Yesterday and To-morrow*, 1925.
- LILLEY, A. LESLIE. *The Programme of Modernism*, Fisher Unwin, 1908. *Modernism: a Record and a Review*, 1908.
- LLOYD, MORGAN C. *Emergent Evolution*, 1923. *Life, Mind, and Spirit*, 1926.
- LODGE, SIR OLIVER. *Life and Matter*, 4th ed., 1907. *The Substance of Faith allied with Science*, 6th ed., 1907. *Continuity*, Dent, 1913. *Making of Man*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1924.
- LOISY, ALFRED. *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, chez l'auteur, 1903. *The Gospel and The Church*, Isbister, E. T., 1903.
- MACAN, R. W. *Religious Changes in Oxford during the Last Fifty Years*, Oxford University Press, 1917.
- MAJOR, H. D. A. *The Gospel of Freedom*, Fisher Unwin, 1912. *A Resurrection of Relics*, 1922. *The Life and Letters of William Boyd Carpenter*, 1925. *Modern Churchman*, Volumes I-XV, Blackwell, 1911-26.
- MATTHEWS, C. H. S. *The Faith of An Average Man*, 1911. *Faith or Fear?* Macmillan, 1916. *Faith and Freedom*, Macmillan, 1919.
- MATTHEWS, W. R. *Studies in Christian Philosophy*, 1921. *The Gospel and the Modern Mind*, 1925.
- MÉNÉGOZ, E. *Religion and Theology*, Williams and Norgate, 1908.
- NEEDHAM, JOSEPH. (Editor) *Science, Religion, and Reality*, The Sheldon Press, 1925.
- PALMER, W. SCOTT. *The Diary of a Modernist*.
- PALMER, FREDERIC. *The Virgin Birth*, Macmillan, 1924.

- PARKS, LEIGHTON. *What is Modernism?* Scribner, 1924.
- PRYKE, W. MAURICE. *Modernism as a Working Faith*, Hefers, 1925.
- RASHDALL, HASTINGS. *Doctrine and Development*, 1898.
- CHRISTUS IN ECCLESIA, T. and T. Clark, 1904. *Conscience and Christ*, 1916. *The Idea of Atonement*, 1919. *Jesus Human and Divine*, Melrose, 1922.
- RAVEN, CHARLES E. *What think ye of Christ?* Macmillan, 1916. *Christian Socialism, 1848-54*, 1920. *Apollinarianism*, 1923.
- RÉVILLE, JEAN. *Liberal Christianity*, Williams and Norgate, 1903.
- RICHARDSON, R. D. *The Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England*, Murray, 1923.
- ROBINSON, J. A. *Some Thoughts on the Incarnation*, Longmans, 1903.
- ROGERS, T. GUY. (Editor) *Liberal Evangelicalism*, 1923.
- RUSSELL, C. F. *Religion and Natural Law*, Blackwell, 1923.
- SABATIER, AUGUSTE. *Religions of the Letter and the Religion of the Spirit*.
- SABATIER, PAUL. *Les Modernistes*, Fischbacher, 1909.
- SANDAY, W. *An Examination of Harnack's "What is Christianity?"* Longmans, 1901. *Christologies Ancient and Modern*, 1910. *Christology and Personality*, 1911. *Bishop Gore's Challenge to Criticism*, Longmans, 1914. *Divine Overruling*, T. and T. Clark, 1920. *The Position of Liberal Theology*, The Faith Press, 1920.
- SHEBBEARE, C. J. *Religion in an Age of Doubt*, 1914.
- SIMPSON, J. Y. *Landmarks in the Struggle between Science and Religion*, 1925.
- SKRINE, J. H. *Pastor Ovium*, 1909. *The Creed and the Creeds*, 1911. *The Gospel of the Manhood*, 1922.
- SMYTH, NEWMAN. *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.
- SPENCER, F. A. M. *The Ethics of the Gospel*, Allen and Unwin, 1925.
- STERRETT, J. MACBRIDE. *Modernism in Religion*, Macmillan, 1922.

- STREETER, B. H. (Editor) *Foundations*, 1912. *Concerning Prayer*, 1918. *Immortality*, 1918. *The Spirit*, Macmillan, 1919. (Author) *Reality*, 1926.
- TEMPLE, W. *Mens Creatrix*, 1917. *Christus Veritas*, 1924.
- TYRRELL, GEORGE. *Through Scylla and Charybdis*, 1907. *Lex Credendi*, Longmans, 1907. *Lex Orandi*, Longmans, 1907. *A Much-abused Letter*, 1907. *Medievalism*, 1909. *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, 1910.
- THOMPSON, J. M. *Jesus according to Mark*, 1909. *Miracles in the New Testament*, 1911. *Through Facts to Faith*, 1912.
- THOMPSON, SILVANUS P. *A Not Impossible Religion*, 1918.
- WADE, G. W. *Old Testament History*, 1903. *New Testament History*, 1922.
- WEBB, C. C. J. *Problems in the Relation of God and Man*, 1911. *God and Personality*, 1919. *Divine Personality and Human Life*, 1920. *Philosophy and the Christian Religion*, Clarendon Press, 1920.
- WILSON, J. M. *The Gospel and the Atonement*, 1901. *Christ's Thought of God*, 1920.
- WOODLOCK, F. *Modernism and the Christian Church*, Longmans, 1925.
- Contentio Veritatis* (1902), by Six Oxford Tutors.
- Anglican Liberalism* (Williams and Norgate, 1908), by Twelve Churchmen.
- Foundations* (1912), by Seven Oxford Men.
- Liberal Evangelicalism* (1923), by Members of the Church of England.
- Creed and Loyalty* (Macmillan, 1924), by Seven Members of the F. E. T. S.
- Evolution in the Light of Modern Knowledge* (Blackie, 1925), by Thirteen Scientists.
- Essays Catholic and Critical* (1926), by Members of the Anglican Communion.
- The Modern Churchman's Library*: Volumes I to VII edited by Dr. H. D. A. Major; published by John Murray.
- Papers in Modern Churchmanship*: Nos. I to X edited by Rev. C. F. Russell, M.A.; published by Longmans, Green and Co.

Churchmen's Union Pamphlets: published by the Churchmen's Union, the Church House, Westminster, S.W. 1.

No. I. *What is Modernism?* by Professor PERCY GARDNER.

No. II. *Modernism and Reconstruction*, by Rev. FRANCIS POWELL.

No. III. *The Modern Movement in the Church of England*, by PHILIP BAGENAL, O.B.E.

No. IV. *Modernity in Christian Ethics*, by Professor PERCY GARDNER.

ENGLISH MODERNIST MAGAZINES AND EDITORS

Liberal Churchman (quarterly), 1904-08. Dr. W. D. Morrison.

The Interpreter (quarterly), 1905-24. Dr. Hewlett Johnson.

The Optimist (quarterly), 1906-19. Rev. S. Proudfoot.

The Modern Churchman (monthly), 1911-27. Dr. H. D. A. Major.

London Bridge (monthly), 1912-13. Rev. E. A. Edghill.

The Challenge (weekly), 1914-22. Dr. W. Temple and Canon C. E. Raven.

INDEX

INDEX

- Abdel Razek, 12.
 Abelard, Peter, 89.
 Adoptionists, Roman, 89.
 Allen, A. V. G., 95.
 Amiel, Henri F., 67 and n., 118.
 Anathemas in Divine Worship,
 Modernist objections to, 176.
 Andrews, Lancelot, 26.
 Anglican Liberalism, 28, 29.
 Anselm, Saint, 108 n., 110.
 Anson, Harold, 39, 178.
 Apollinarius, 89.
 Apostles' Creed, the, 174, 177, 178.
 Aquinas, Thomas, Saint, 96, 110,
 155.
 Aristotle, 70, 162.
 Arius, 89.
 Arnold, Matthew, 38, 132, 202.
 Arnold, Thomas, 27, 38.
 Ashley, Sir W., 236, 237.
 Athanasius, Saint, 166, 175.
 Augustine, Saint, 111.

 Bacon, Francis, Lord, 192.
 Baker, J. F. Bethune-, 126, 127,
 149 n., 158, 242, 243.
 Balfour, Arthur J., Earl, 71, 202.
 Barbauld, Anna L., 116.
 Barnes, Ernest, 69.
 Barnett, Samuel A., 38.
 Barnett, Mrs. S. A., 38.
 Basilides, 89.
 Battifol, 24.
 Baxter, Richard, 81, 116.
 Beatitudes, the, as creed, 180.
 Benson, Godfrey R., Lord Charn-
 wood, 237, 238.
 Bergson, Henri, 202.
 Bernard of Morlaix, 116.
 Bethune-Baker. *See* Baker.
 Beyschlag, 28.
 Bezzant, J. S., 104, 131.
 Bible, the, infallibility and finality
 of, being replaced by belief in
 inspiration of, 117, 118; con-
 tains the Word of God, 117.
 Bindley, T. H., 243, 244.
 Blackie, J. S., 56.
 Blake, William, 113, 202.
 Blavatsky, Mme, 195.
 Blomfield, Charles J., 106.
 Boethius, 155.
 Bolshevism, is it Modernism or
 reaction? 13.
 Bosanquet, Bernard, 188, 189, 202.
 Bouquet, A. C., 32 n.
 Bousset, 28.
 Bradley, F. H., 202.
 Branford, Victor, 14.
 Brémond, M., 24.
 Broad Churchmanship and Eng-
 lish Modernism, 24 ff., 37.
 Browning, Robert, 38, 88, 116,
 140, 202.

- Bunyan, John, 63, 175, 226.
 Burgon, Dean, 116, 117.
 Burkitt, F. C., 29, 177 n.
 Burns, Robert, 92.
 Butler, Joseph, 26, 74, 91, 131, 215.

 Caird, Edward, 202.
 Caird, John, 202.
 Caldecott, Alfred, 211, 212.
 Calvin, John, 96, 110.
 Carpenter, W. Boyd, 81, 203, 204, 223.
Catholic Encyclopædia, 12.
 Chalcedon, formula of, 157.
 Charles, R. H., 36 n., 47, 244, 245.
 Charnwood, Lord. *See* Benson, G. R.
 China and Modernism, 13.
 Christian faith, the position to be held, 98.
 Christian religion, study of origin and history of, and its effect, 65. And *see* Christianity.
 Christian theology, and evolution, 69 ff.; and heretics, 90, 91; the profoundest truths of, 92, 93.
 Christianity, essence of, 30 ff.; the religion of the Spirit, 48 ff.; considered in various aspects, 140 ff.; Modernist defence against Secularist attacks on, 197, and its allies, 201-203.
 Christological evolution, stages of, 151 ff. And *see* Logos Christology.
 Church and State, alliance between, in England, 26, 27.
 Church of Christ, the 48 ff.
 Church of England, status of Modernism in, 43 ff.; and Unitarianism, 46; the ideal seed-bed of Modernism, 47, 48.
 Cicero, 216.
 Clough, Arthur Hugh, 38, 94, 202.
 Clutton-Brock, A., 224, 239.
 Colenso, John W., 38, 60.
 Coleridge, Samuel T., 34, 38, 132, 202.
 Colet, John, 80.
 Comparative Religion, 65.
 Copernican System, 72.
 Coulton, G. G., 239-241.
 Cranmer, Thomas, 96.
 Creed, a, and Confession of faith, questions concerning, 181, and the answers, 180, 181, 231-253. And *see* Modernist Creed.
 Creeds, Modernist interpretation of, as viewed by others, 186 ff.; policy of silence toward, inadmissible, 191, 192.
 Creeds, baptismal, 173, 177, 178.
 Creeds, ecumenical, 175, 176.
 Creighton, Mandell, 51.
 Croce, 202.

 Danks, William, 186.
 Darwin, C., *Origin of Species*, 58, 59.
 Davenport, S. F., 168 n.
 Davidson, Randall T., Archbishop, 151.
 Dawkins, W. Boyd, 64.
 Diggle, Bishop, 81.
 Disraeli, Benjamin, 27, 59.
 Divine and human, affinity of, 167.

- Divine Immanence, 163, 166.
- Dogma, Modernists' attitude toward, 79 ff.; etymology of the term, 82; three classes of Christian: spiritual, 83, 84; historical, 85; scholastic, 86-88.
- Dougall, Lily, 36 *n.*, 224.
- Duchesne, 19, 24.
- Earth, former belief as to existence of, 58.
- Ecclesiastical press, the, and Modernism, 222, 223.
- Eddington, Arthur S., 62, 63.
- Eden, Garden of, allegorical interpretation of story of, 110.
- Edinburgh Review*, 23.
- Egyptian Modernism, 12, 13.
- Einstein, Albert, 72.
- Electrical theory of matter, effect of, 62, 63.
- Emmet, Cyril W., 36 *n.*, 40, 45, 46, 147, 207, 208, 224, 245-247.
- Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9.
- English Modernism, Liberal Catholic wing of, 24; distinction between and Broad Churchmanship, 25 ff., 37; history of rise of, 28 ff.; and the Church and Sacraments, 35, 36; and the New Testament, 36; objection to, and final adoption of the name, 41; situation of, in the Church, 43; F. J. S. Hort, the father of, 69, 76, 77.
- English Modernists, less extreme than Roman Modernists, 123; leading writers among, 193 *n.*
- Erigena, Johannes Scotus, 89.
- Eschatology, traditions connected with, 112-116.
- Eucken, Rudolf, 202.
- Everlasting punishment, doctrine of, 106, 107.
- Evolution, effect of triumph of, 59 ff., 69-71.
- Fairbairn, Andrew M., 167, 202.
- Fawkes, Alfred, 23, 216, 226, 227, 248, 249.
- Flammarion, Camille, 73.
- Fogazzaro, Antonio, 20.
- Frazer, Sir James G., 65, 145, 146, 179 *n.*
- Free-Will, dogma of, 91, 92.
- Freud, 66.
- Fundamentalism, 18.
- Gardner, Alice, 36 *n.*
- Gardner, Percy, 9, 10, 11, 30, 31, 40, 41, 134, 231-236.
- Gentile, 202.
- Geology and *Genesis*, 59.
- German Modernism, 13.
- Gibbon, Edward, 207.
- Gilbert, W. S., 28.
- Glazebrook, M. G., 133, 134, 224.
- Glover, 207.
- God, doctrine of, 102-106.
- Goethe, Johann F. von, 4.
- Gore, Charles, 126, 150, 151.
- Green, T. H., 38.
- Gregory of Nyassa, Saint, 110.
- Guizot, F. P. G., 15.
- Guyau, J. M., 195.

- Hahn, August, 174.
 Haldane, J. S., 71, 72, 73, 74, 131, 132, 203.
 Haldane, Richard B., Viscount, 202.
 Halifax, Lord. *See* Wood, C. L.
 Hall, John, 80.
 Handley, Hubert, 40, 48, 189, 190, 191.
 Hankey, Donald, 100 *n.*, 109.
 Harnack, Theodosius, 22, 28, 33, 207.
 Harris, Charles, 219.
 Harrison, Frederic, 214.
 Hastings, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, 9.
 Heiler, German Modernist, 18.
 Helvidius, 128.
 Herbert, George, 26.
 Heretics, small and great, 88, 89; their service to theology, 90-92.
 Hermas, 206.
 Hermon, Mount, 6.
Hibbert Journal, 39, 92.
 Hibbert Lectures, 65.
 Hindu Modernism, 13.
 Höffding, Harald, 93, 202, 216.
 Hooker, Richard, 26, 87, 88, 106.
 Hort, F. J. A., father of English Modernism, 69, 76, 77; 38, 70, 71, 116.
 Houtin, 24.
 Hugel, F. von, 23, 24.
 Hughes, Thomas, 38.
 Hume, Professor, 13.
 Hutchinson, F. E., 247, 248.
 Huxley, Thomas H., 67, 203, 208.
 Ignatius, St., 128.
 Illingworth, J. R., 163, 199.
 Immortality, Modernist belief in, 116.
 Incarnation, the, 93, 151, 160, 161, 162, 165, 166.
 Indian Modernism, 13.
 Infant baptism and original guilt, 111, 112.
 Inge, W. R., 22, 23, 136, 162, 172 *n.*, 249.
 Irenæus, Saint, 161.
 Jacks, L. P., 92.
 Jackson, Foakes-, 140.
 James, William, 66, 113, 114, 215.
 Jeans, Professor, 73.
 Jesuanity, 140, 146, 147.
 Jesuolatry, 140.
 Jesus Christ, attitude of, toward Miracles, 134, 135; and Christianity, 141, 142, 145, 146; in the Synoptic Gospels, 142, 143, 147; dominates the primitive Church, 144; and the formula of Chalcedon, 157; kinship of God and Man in, 159, 160.
 Jewish Modernism, 13.
 John, Saint, Gospel of, 49, 50, 70, 98, 132, 133, 135, 152, 154, 161.
 John the Baptist, 133.
 Jones, Sir Henry, 202.
 Jordan, L. H., 19, 21.
 Joseph, Saint, 128.
 Jowett, Benjamin, 27, 38.
 Jung, Herr, 66.
 Justin Martyr, 128, 166.

- Kant, Immanuel, 116.
 Keble, John, 25, 202.
 Kelvin, Lord. *See* Thomson, W.
 Kemal Pasha, 13.
 Kennedy, Studdert, 101.
 Kenosis, doctrine of the, 150.
 Kikiyu incident, the, 212.
 Kingsley, Charles, 38, 59.
 Kipling, Rudyard, 202 and *n.*
 Knox, Roland, A., 39.
- Laberthonnière, M., 24.
 Lake, Kirsopp, 186, 213.
 Le Roy, M., 24.
 Leo XIII, Pope, the *Pascendi Gregis*, 19, 20, 23.
 Liberal Churchmanship, 27 ff., 33 ff., 37, 38.
 Liberal Protestantism, 28, 29.
 Lightfoot, Joseph B., 29, 81.
 Lilley, A. Leslie, 11, 22.
 Litledale, Dr., 176.
 Lodge, Sir Oliver, 62 *n.*, 203.
 Logos Christology, 153-165.
 Loisy, Alfred, 19, 22, 23, 24, 31, 33, 122, 207, 213.
 London *Times*, 12.
 Longfellow, H. W., 86.
 Lord's Prayer, the, as creed, 180.
 Lubbock, Sir John, Lord Avebury, 64.
 Lucretius, 196.
 Luke, Saint, 49, 152.
 Luke, Saint, Gospel of, 135.
 Luther, Martin, 8, 96, 148.
 Lyell, Sir Charles, 59.
- Macan, R. W., 11, 12.
 McColl, Canon, 90.
 MacDonald, George, 202.
 McDougall, W., 203.
 Macnutt, F. B., 100 *n.*
 Major, H. D. A., 41, 98, 99, 149.
 Mansel, Dean, 117.
 Manu, Laws of, 13.
 Marcion, 89.
 Mark, Saint, Gospel of, 135, 151.
 Masefield, John, 202.
 Materialists, 194, 195.
 Matthew, Saint, Gospel of, 135.
 Matthews, C. H. S., 249, 250.
 Matthews, W. R., 202.
 Maurice, Frederick D., 27, 38, 106.
 Mazzini, Giuseppe, 19, 217.
 Mechanistic theory of the universe, and miracles, 131, 132.
 Mediævalism, 18, 32.
 Melancthon, P., 96.
 Ménégos, Edouard, 29.
 Merz, John T., 202.
 Mignot, M., 24.
 Mill, J. S., 189.
 Milton, John, 86, 162, 185.
 Minocchi, Salvatore, 20.
 Missionaries, Anglican, and Modernism, 210 ff.
Modern Churchman, The, 41, 101, 211, 212, 231-253.
 Modern Churchmen's Conference (1921), accepts designation of "Modernism," 41; 149, 150, 156, 158.
 Modernism, definition, 8 ff.; not limited to Christianity, 12, 13; varying significance of the term,

- 18; in its religious sense, came from Roman Catholicism, 19, 20; views of opponents of, as to its future, 209, 219-221; three great advantages of, over Traditionalism, 218, 219; type of leaders of, 224.
- Modernist, the, why compelled to be one, 51 ff.; the effect, not the cause, of Modernism, 54; and the New Truth, 54-56, 58 ff., 68, 77, 78; his attitude toward dogma, 79 ff., 94-96; his view of certain doctrines that need reformation, 102 ff.; summary of his attitude toward reconstruction, 122-124; his invitation to the Traditionalist, 225.
- Modernist Creed, a, in which controversial issues are avoided, 98-100.
- Modernist Movement, the account of, 18 ff.
- Montefiore, Claude, 13.
- Morgan, C. Lloyd, 71, 203.
- Morley, John, Viscount, 186, 187.
- Müller, Max, 65.
- Murri, Don Romolo, 20.
- Nature and miracles, 130, 131.
- Nestorius, 89.
- New English Dictionary*, 8.
- New Testament, the, historical accuracy of, disproved, 66.
- New Truth, the, 55, 56, 58 ff.; its significance for traditional Christianity, 68; the Modernist's problem in relation to, 68, 77, 78.
- Newbolt, Sir H., 202.
- Newman, John H., Cardinal, 31, 178, 198.
- Nicæa, Council of, 175.
- Nicene Creed, use of at the Eucharist, favored, 182, 183.
- Nietzsche, F., 198, 199.
- Noble, William Belden, 6.
- Old Testament, the, in the light of the New Truth, 64.
- Omar Khayyam, 122.
- Origen, 89, 159.
- Otto, Professor, 172 n., 202.
- Paget, Francis, 225.
- Paley, William, 132.
- Pascal, Blaise, 73.
- Pasteur, Louis, 61.
- Paul, Saint, 5, 49, 51, 57, 70, 78, 112, 142, 143, 163.
- Paul of Samosata, 89.
- Pelagius, 89.
- Perceval, Bishop, 38.
- Pfleiderer, Herr, 28.
- Philip, Saint, 170.
- Pius X, Pope, 12, 20.
- Pleroma*, 160, 173.
- Pringle-Pattison, A. St., 168, 202.
- Pryke, Maurice, 210, 224.
- Psychology, and the New Truth, 66 ff.
- Psychotherapy, 67.
- Pym, T. W., 100 n.

- Quakers, 52.
Quarterly Review, 23.
- Rabelais, François, 56.
- Rashdall, Hastings, 104, 109, 120, 121, 150, 151, 156, 158, 160 *n.*, 164, 165, 168, 177 *n.*, 188, 210, 224, 251, 252.
- Reichel, Sir H. R., 241, 242.
- Religion, a definite department of scientific study, 65.
- Renan, Ernest, 88, 122.
- Revelation, doctrine of, 119-121; Modernist view of, 119, 120.
- Réville, Albert, 29.
- Richardson, R. D., 43, 44.
- Robertson, F. W., 38.
- Robinson, J. Armitage, 151.
- Roman Modernism, origin of, 20 *ff.*; interest in, in England, 22 *ff.*; difference between, and English Modernism, 30 *ff.*; failure of the movement, 43.
- Rossetti, Christina, 27.
- Royce, Josiah, 202.
- Rufinus, 174.
- Russell, C. F., 169.
- Russell, Sir Edward, 28.
- Sabatier, Auguste, 29, 82, 119, 200.
- Sabatier, Paul, 10, 23, 24, 55 *n.*, 89, 96.
- Sabellius, 89.
- Sacred Books of the East*, 65.
- Sacrifice, propitiatory, doctrine of, 107-110.
- Said Ben Ayab, 92.
- Salmon, George, 134.
- Sanday, W., 10, 15, 40, 224.
- Saragossa, siege of, 15.
- Schweitzer, Albert, 33, 36 *n.*, 75, 76.
- Secularists, 194, 195, 196, 197, 200.
- Seeley, Sir John R., 32.
- Shakespeare, W., *The Tempest*, 115.
- Shaw, G. Bernard, 12, 56.
- Sidgwick, Henry, 186, 188 and *n.*
- Simpson, J. Y., 104, 105.
- Sin, "original" and "actual," 110-112.
- Smith, William R., 64.
- Smyth, Newman, 10, 35.
- Soddy, F., 203.
- Sohm, Rudolf, 29.
- Sorley, W. R., 202.
- South, Dr., 162.
- Spinoza, Baruch de, 104, 116.
- Stanley, Arthur P., 27, 32, 38, 185 *n.*
- Starbuck, Mr., 66.
- Sterrett, J. MacBride, 10, 11.
- Stevenson, R. L., 202.
- Storr, Vernon F., 41, 42.
- Streeter, B. H., 36 *n.*
- Swete, H. B., 32.
- Talbot, Neville, 100 *n.*
- Taylor, A. E., 202.
- Temple, Frederick, Archbishop, 67 and *n.*
- Temple, William, 157 and *n.*, 202.
- Tennant, Frederick R., 131.

GER. THEO. SEMINARY
 LIBRARY

- Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, 38, 116, 202.
- Tertullian, 184.
- Theological colleges, Traditionalist training of clergy in, 223.
- Thirlwall, Connop, 27.
- Thompson, Francis, 202.
- Thompson, J. M., 137.
- Thompson, Silvanus, 203.
- Thomson, J. Arthur, 203.
- Thomson, W., Lord Kelvin, 203.
- Thring, Edward, 38.
- Tollinton, R. B., 147 *n*.
- Traditionalism, opposed to Modernism in English Church, 18; advantages of Modernism over, 218, 219.
- Traditionalists, how converted into Modernists, 54 ff.; and Evolution, 59 ff., 77, 78; and heretics, 90; doctrines of, that need reformation, 102 ff.; allegorical interpretation of Garden of Eden narrative by, 110; and miracles, 125 ff.
- Turkish Modernists, 13.
- Tylor, Sir E. B., 64.
- Tyrrell, George, 9, 23, 24, 47, 48.
- Unitarianism, and the Church of England, 46.
- Vaughan, Henry, 116.
- Vergil, 161.
- Virgin Birth, the, 128, 129, 151, 152.
- Voltaire, 215.
- Wallace, Sir A. R., 73, 203.
- Ward, James, 71, 104, 202.
- Ward, Mary A. (Mrs. Humphreys), 10.
- Watson, Bishop, 179.
- Webb, C. C. J., 155, 202.
- Weinel, Herr, 28, 75.
- Wendt, Herr, 28.
- Wesley, Charles, 148.
- Westcott, Brooke F., 38, 116, 143.
- Westminster Gazette*, 8.
- Whately, Richard, 27.
- White, Douglas, 109.
- Williams, N. P., 127, 128.
- Wilson, J. M., 58, 109, 208.
- Wood, Charles L., Viscount Halifax, 186.
- Woodlock, Father, 186, 209, 210.
- Wordsworth, John, 206.
- Wordsworth, W., 16, 102, 103, 116, 136, 163, 202.
- Wynter, R. A., 220, 221.
- Xavier, François, Saint, 116.

####

83335

230.065

M288e

Major, H.D.A.

English Modernism

Nov 1 '55	E. Stoff	10 '56			
CT 25 '56	R. Foster	8 '56			

83335

230.065

M288e

BT78 .M37 1927

Major, H. D. A. (Henry
Dewsbury Alves), 1871-1961.

English modernism

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



00055131